TEWART,
WILLIAM ST.
nd, London.

Cathedral Library,
ELY.

BIBLIOTHECÆ
ECCLESIÆ CATHEDRALIS ELIENSIS
DONO DEDIT,
Gulielmus Selwyn S.T.P.
EJUSDEM ECCLESIÆ Canonicus
A. D. 1867

ON THE RIGHT USE

OF

THE EARLY FATHERS.

ON

THE RIGHT USE

OF

The Early Fathers;

TWO SERIES OF LECTURES,

DELIVERED IN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

BY THE REV. J. J. BLUNT, B.D.,

LATE MARGARET PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY.

SECOND EDITION, CORRECTED.

WITH

INDEX.

LONDON:
JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.
1858.

PREFACE.

It was stated by Professor Blunt, in the Introductory Lecture on the Study of the Early Fathers,[1] which he delivered shortly after his election to the Margaret Professorship, that he intended to "take the Fathers successively in their order; submitting to" his hearers "the pith and body of each; some portions of them abridged; but much of them, especially such passages as seem to have a peculiar value and force, literally .... translated."[2] His Lectures, during the five years which ensued, were in accordance with this announcement; and it was not until he had gone through a considerable number of the Early Fathers in this way, that the Course "On the Right Use" of them, consisting of two Series, was delivered, the first in the October Term of 1845, the second in the October Term of 1846; subsequent to which, additions were made to many of the Lectures, and the Second Series, especially, was considerably enlarged.

It may be presumed, therefore, that this Course of Lectures exhibits, in a connected form, the *conclusions* to which the author intended to lead his hearers by the detailed examination of the Fathers, through which he had conducted them. And that his own conviction of their soundness was well-grounded at the first, and was never shaken afterwards, may be inferred from these Lectures being, as he tells us, "the results of many years' patient reading and thought,"[3] and from

[1] See "Two Introductory Lectures on the Study of the Early Fathers, with a brief Memoir of the Author." Cambridge, 1856.

[2] First Introductory Lecture, p. 6.

[3] On the Right Use of the Early Fathers, p. 215.

his adhering in them to the plan which he originally laid down.

In pursuance of that plan, after pointing out in the first Lecture of the First Series "a few of the more undeniable tokens"[1] of our Church's respect for antiquity, and the causes which led to its decline, he proceeds in those that follow to enlarge on the observation which he had made in the Introductory Lecture already referred to, that "we must be careful not to let our estimate of the worth, or worthlessness of the Fathers, be formed at second hand, from a mere perusal of such authors as Daillé and Barbeyrac, whose only object is to single out whatever imperfections they present, and place them before their readers in continuous succession, and without one lucid interval of merit."[2] The objections of Daillé are stated and answered in eight of the Lectures, and those of Barbeyrac more briefly in the two last. And as it had been urged that where the Romanist, the Puritan, or the Socinian are at issue with ourselves respecting the true interpretation of the inspired text, there is no better way of "testing our respective opinions than by recourse to the Primitive Church;"[3] the peculiar tenets of the Romanist are here tried by this test, and it is shown that however distasteful the testimony of the Fathers may have been to Daillé and to those whose opinions he represented, it is favourable to the Reformed Church of England, especially upon those points in which she is opposed to the Church of Rome.

But the more complete illustration of the advantages to be derived from the study of the Early Fathers is reserved for the Second Series. The first five Lectures illustrate their use as contributing to the Evidences; and the insinuations thrown out in the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of Gibbon's History, are met by a review of their testimony to the early diffusion of Christianity, to the rank and character of the Christians, and to the nature, extent, and intensity of the persecutions they underwent. In the sixth, the evidence for the continuance of miraculous powers beyond the lives of those on whom the Apostles laid their hands, is considered. In the seventh, eighth, and ninth, the use of the Fathers is shown in determining the nature and constitution of the

[1] On the Right Use of the Early Fathers, p. 4.

[2] First Introductory Lecture, p. 39.

[3] p. 35.

Church, in settling the Canon, and in ascertaining the text of Scripture. In the next five, which relate to the interpretation of Scripture, the Socinian and the Calvinistic schemes are compared with the language of the Early Fathers, and shown to be inconsistent with it, as that of the Romanist was shown to be in the First Series: while, in the concluding Lecture, the importance of a knowledge of the Fathers, to the expositor of Scripture, is further argued from the information they furnish on early heresies, and other points, obscurely alluded to in the New Testament; and a few instances are added of their use in the exposition of particular texts.

There is reason to think that some of the Lectures would have been enriched with additional illustrations, if the author had lived to perfect the work, and prepare it for the press, as he had intended. It is hoped, however, that its publication in the shape in which he left it, may serve to promote the design which he had at heart in composing it; by inducing the theological student to turn his "attention, next after the Scriptures, to the Primitive Fathers; not with blind allegiance, as authorities to which he must in all things bow, but with such respect as is due to the only witnesses we have, of the state and opinions of the Church immediately after the Apostles' times, and such as the Church of England herself encourages."[1]

[1] First Introductory Lecture, pp. 11, 12.

CONTENTS.

FIRST SERIES.

ON THE OBJECTIONS TO THE STUDY OF THE FATHERS ADVANCED BY DAILLÉ AND BY BARBEYRAC.

LECTURE I.

PAGE

The study of the Early Fathers recommended. Their testimony appealed to by the Church of England in the Prayer Book, in the Articles, in the Canons; and by the Reformers, *e. g.* Jewel, Philpot, Grindal. Decline of reverence for antiquity at the period of the Rebellion. Milton. Effect of the Revolution. Influence of foreign Reformers. Treatises of Daillé and Barbeyrac 3

LECTURE II.

Division of Daillé's treatise into two heads. His first argument in support of his first proposition. Unfairness of it. Discussion of a passage in Eusebius. Fragments of the Early Fathers collected by Dr. Routh. Illustrations of their value. Second argument of Daillé. Incidental allusions to important topics in the Fathers, overlooked by him. Their evidence not to be gathered without careful study. Illustration of this in establishing the doctrine and ritual of the Church. And in the Romish controversy, *e. g.* on Transubstantiation, the Papal Supremacy, Auricular Confession, Image Worship 22

LECTURE III.

Third argument of Daillé—its insufficiency to establish his proposition. The quotation of the Sibyl by the Fathers explained. Vindication of them from the charge of dishonesty in quoting Apocryphal books. Opinions of Vossius, Hammond, and others, on the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Pastor of Hermas. Arguments of Daillé against the Epistles of

PAGE

Ignatius inconclusive. Comparison of passages in Irenæus, Polycarp, Tertullian, with passages in those Epistles. Quotation of them by Origen. Improbability that Eusebius should have been deceived as to their genuineness 46

LECTURE IV.

Fourth argument of Daillé. Vagueness of it. The Fathers disposed of in the same way by Priestley. Paucity of MSS. Antiquity of some of the Versions. Improbability that the Fathers previous to Cyprian have been tampered with by the Romanists. Discussion of passages claimed as favourable to Romish views. The writings of Irenæus full of evidence against them. His appeal to tradition the same as that of the Church of England. The writings of Clemens occasionally corrupt. Discussion of passages in them claimed by the Romanists. Germ of Romish errors discoverable in Clemens. The same remark true of Tertullian. But neither his writings nor those of Hippolytus in a condition satisfactory to a Romish interpolator 66

LECTURE V.

State of the writings of Origen. Theory of their interpolation by the Romanists untenable. Their testimony against Transubstantiation; Prayers in a tongue not understood by the people; the withholding of the Scriptures; Disciplina arcani; the use of Images; Vows of celibacy; the Worship of saints or angels; Purgatory. First instance of Romish interpolation pointed out by James. Neglect of the Early Fathers by the Romanists. Remark of Dodwell. The story of Paschasinus insufficient to support the inference drawn from it by Daillé 86

LECTURE VI.

Interpolation of Cyprian in the editions of Manutius and of Pamelius; continued by the Benedictine editors. Purity of earlier editions. No evidence of the corruption of MSS. Limited extent of the remaining corruptions in the edition of Manutius. Mass of evidence in Cyprian against the Romanists; on the Papal Supremacy; on Transubstantiation; on Tradition; on Absolution; on Extreme Unction; on the number of the Sacraments. Germ of abuses discoverable in him; not introduced by the Romanists. Estimate of patristic testimony formed by English Divines since the Reformation. Causes of the outcry against the Fathers raised by Daillé and others 105

LECTURE VII.

The Fathers objected to by Daillé on account of their obscurity. Value of incidental evidence. Clear testimony of Justin and of Tertullian on the Arian question, and on the Eucharist. Charge of *wilful* obscurity. Occasional reserve accounted for. Frank exposition of the Christian Ritual in the Apologies. Reserve of Clemens Alexandrinus. Plan of his writings;

PAGE

and motive of it. Difficulty of Tertullian. Method of studying him recommended. Testimony of the Fathers to principles distasteful to Daillé. Further objection to their style on account of the change which has taken place in the meaning of words. Corresponding changes in things to be tested by comparison with the Primitive Church. Result of that comparison 127

LECTURE VIII.

Clemens Alexandrinus the only Ante-Nicene Father charged with disingenuousness by Daillé. His instance from Cardinal Perron. Passages liable to misconstruction in Clemens and in Origen. Inference of Daillé from the illogical reasoning of the Fathers disputed. Their use of the *argumentum ad hominem* explained. Value of their testimony notwithstanding. Instances of inconsistency from Clemens and from Tertullian. Relative importance of different topics not confounded by the Fathers. Daillé's instances to the contrary examined. The Early Fathers fair exponents of the sentiments of the early Church; especially where they were identified with their respective Churches; and where they concur with each other. Allowance to be made for the peculiar character of their times 146

LECTURE IX.

Second proposition of Daillé. His charges against the Fathers of inaccuracy, ignorance of Hebrew, use of allegory, examined. Important principle involved in the latter. Why it was so largely resorted to. Excessive use of it by Clemens and Origen. Doctrinal errors of the Fathers insufficient to overthrow their testimony. Daillé's instances of their discrepancies chiefly Post-Nicene. Discrepancies of the Ante-Nicene confined to minor points. Their concurrence in important ones the more striking. Concluding objection of Daillé. The appeal to the Fathers not excluded by the sixth Article. Discretion of our Church in her use of them. Scripture and antiquity the authorities appealed to by our Reformers. 164

LECTURE X.

Occasion of Barbeyrac's work. His imperfect acquaintance with the Fathers, and misconstruction of their writings. His charge against Justin, that he encouraged volunteering martyrdom, examined. Sentiments of Clemens, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, on this subject. Warmth of their language accounted for. Martyrdom instrumental in the establishment of Christianity. Language of the Fathers concerning marriage explained by the circumstances of their times. True view of the case given by Tertullian in his treatise Ad Uxorem. Extravagances of later times not chargeable on the Early Fathers 182

LECTURE XI.

PAGE

Further illustration of the defect in Barbeyrac's reasoning. Examination of his charge against Tertullian of interdicting trades connected with idolatry, the profession of arms, national customs, offices of state. Unfairness of regarding in the abstract what was meant only to apply to particular circumstances. Sentiments of Tertullian and Cyprian on self-defence accounted for. Justification of idolatry among the Pagans in Clemens, owing to a misinterpretation of Deut. iv. 19. His real opinion on that subject. Defence of writers subsequent to the third century declined. Late ecclesiastical antiquity less deserving of confidence. Subjects of the second Series 201

SECOND SERIES.

ON THE ADVANTAGES TO BE DERIVED FROM THE STUDY OF THE EARLY FATHERS.

LECTURE I.

Use of the Fathers in relation to the Evidences. Their testimony to the *wide dispersion* of the Gospel opposed to the statements of Gibbon. His unfairness in citing them. Argument from their incidental allusions. More direct testimony to the early establishment of Christianity on the shores of the Mediterranean and Euxine, and in the countries beyond the Euphrates. Its secret progress illustrated from the Acts, from St. Paul's Epistles, from the Fathers. Its disturbance of the social relations instrumental to its propagation. Exposition of Phil. i. 12–18. Further illustrations. Effect of the public games 219

LECTURE II.

The insinuation of Gibbon respecting the *rank and character* of the early Christians, originally advanced by the heathen opponents of Christianity, and answered by the Apologists. The fact, that many persons of wealth and education were Christians, proved, from the acquirements of the Fathers, from their specific assertion of it, from their addressing themselves to the rich and intelligent, from the fund at the disposal of the Church. Variety of demands upon the pecuniary resources of the Christians. Remarks on the Libellatici 238

LECTURE III.

PAGE

The insinuation of Gibbon, that the Church was recruited, 1°. By abandoned characters, suggested by Celsus, inconsistent with the primitive discipline, the probation before Baptism, the responsibility attaching to the sponsors, the appeal of the Apologists to the pure morality of the Christians, their charges of laxity against the heretics and the philosophers, the treatment of the lapsed, the frequency of excommunication: 2°. By mercenary persons, repudiated by Origen, inconsistent with the precautions used against mercenary motives and the maladministration of the Church fund, and with a passage in the Constitutions: 3°. By foundlings, incapable of being substantiated by any positive evidence. Probability that it might happen occasionally. Negative proof that it did not happen systematically. How the Church fund was really expended . . 257

LECTURE IV.

The opinion of Sir James Mackintosh on Gibbon's sixteenth chapter. The statements of the latter to be corrected by a review of the Early Fathers. Their testimony, 1°. To the *extent of the persecutions* of the Christians. The classification into ten great persecutions untenable. Inquiry whether the edicts of Nero and Domitian were repealed. Effect of those of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus. Christianity a capital offence from the time of Nero downwards. Martyrdom of Ignatius. Remarks of Tertullian on Trajan's edict. Subsequent activity of persecution. That at Lyons and Vienne a sample of others. The assertion of Origen respecting the number of martyrs relative, not positive. Motives in various quarters for setting persecution on foot 273

LECTURE V.

Testimony of the Fathers, 2°. To the *intensity* of the persecutions, unduly extenuated by Gibbon. Reflections on his account of the Letter of Pliny and of the martyrdom of Cyprian. Early narratives of martyrdom not to be confounded with the fictions of later times. The sources of information as reliable as those from which Gibbon drew his history. Explanation of a passage in Eusebius unfairly used by him. 3°. To the *nature* of the persecutions. Domestic as well as official ones foretold by Christ. Verification in the effect of Christianity on the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant. Its inconsistency with many trades and occupations. Consequent pecuniary losses to the converts. Their embarrassment in legal and commercial proceedings . . . 293

LECTURE VI.

Review of passages in the Early Fathers bearing witness to the exercise of *miraculous powers* in their times. Unanimity of this testimony. Estimate, which ought to be formed of it; and difficulty of resisting it. The powers of exorcism and healing diseases more decidedly asserted than others. Correspondence of this with the terms in which the powers were conferred,

PAGE

and with the record of their exercise in the Acts. The same correspondence between the Scriptural and Ecclesiastical records observable in another particular. The exercise of miraculous powers by those on whom the Apostles laid their hands established by inspired authority. The theory of the cessation of all miracles with their lives unsatisfactory . 310

LECTURE VII.

Use of the Fathers in the inquiry concerning the *nature and construction of the Church*. The outline of it, which may be inferred from the Acts and the Apostolical Epistles, filled up by them. A standing ministry deriving its authority from the Apostles, and consisting of three Orders, included in their definition of it. Direct proof of this from the Fathers themselves: indirect, from the practice of heretics. Incidental character of the evidence. Variety of quarters from which it is drawn. Conclusion in the words of Hooker 329

LECTURE VIII.

Use of the Fathers in settling the *Canon* of the New Testament. Appeal to them in the sixth Article. Method of establishing the Canon stated by Jones. Illustration of this method with reference to the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, the Revelation. Discussion of questions, whether the autographs of the Apostles existed in the time of Tertullian; whether any Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians is missing; whether the Epistle to the Ephesians is rightly so entitled; whether St. Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Use of the Fathers in proving that the *substance* of the Canonical books, the beginnings and endings of the Gospels, the incidents of our Lord's ministry, the circumstances recorded in the Acts, the tenour of the Epistles, were the same in their times as they are now 346

LECTURE IX.

Use of the Fathers in ascertaining the *text* of the New Testament. Their motives for accuracy in this particular. Importance of their testimony in establishing the genuineness of whole passages. The impression produced by it increased, when the occasion of it is known. Its use further exemplified, where the genuineness of the passage is doubtful, as 1 John v. 7, and the subscription of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. The same testimony of still greater value in the criticism of single words; opposed to the reading of Griesbach and Wetstein in Acts xx. 28, and to that of the "Improved Version" in Rom. ix. 5. Some other examples . 365

LECTURE X.

Use of the Fathers in unfolding the *meaning* of Scripture: I. Their testimony opposed to the Socinian scheme, 1°. In the *spirit* of their expositions, which is evangelical, not rationalistic. Extent to which the Old Testament is applied by them to Jesus Christ. Concurrence of our

PAGE

Church and of our standard divines in this principle of interpretation. The proof of it from the Fathers independent of the merit of their particular expositions. Actual uncertainty as to the extent of symbolical teaching in Scripture. 2°. On the doctrine of the Trinity. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. The Creed of the early Church shown to have been Trinitarian from the exposition of particular texts; from the opinions of early heretics; from primitive practices and formularies; and from the correspondence of the Athanasian Creed with the writers of the first three centuries. Unguarded language of these writers, especially of Origen, accounted for 383

LECTURE XI.

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Socinian scheme, 3°. On the doctrine of the Atonement. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. The death of Christ, according to the Fathers, a sacrifice—expiatory, vicarious, universally necessary. Unreasonableness and hardihood of rejecting a doctrine thus guaranteed. 4°. On the nature and effect of Baptism. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. Unanimity of the Fathers on Baptismal Regeneration. Variety of forms in which they assert it. The effect of Baptism, according to them, the work of the Holy Ghost. Their account of it meant to apply to infants as well as to adults. Evidence for Infant Baptism. The office of sponsors recognised. The benefit not ascribed to the *opus operatum*, but represented as contingent on the observance of the Baptismal promises. Strictness of the Early Church in this particular 416

LECTURE XII.

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Socinian scheme, 5°. On the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. Sentiments of the Fathers. The Eucharist contemplated by them, first as a *sacrifice*, not material (except as including an oblation of the fruits of the earth), but commemorative of the Sacrifice of Christ; and secondly, as the *spiritual* food of his Body and Blood. Their testimony unfavourable to the Romish as well as to the Socinian views. The benefit not ascribed to the *opus operatum*, but represented as dependent on the fitness of the recipient. Strictness in this particular 445

LECTURE XIII.

Use of the Fathers in unfolding the *meaning* of Scripture: II. Their testimony opposed to the Calvinistic scheme, 1°. On the freedom of the will. The assertion of it by the Fathers distinct and emphatic. 2°. On the degree of human corruption. The consequences of the Fall recognised by the Fathers, but not in a manner satisfactory to the Calvinist. Their language upon this point dubious and conflicting. Cause of their embarrassment. Illustrations. Vindication of the Fathers from the charge of Pelagianism. Their teaching on the necessity of Divine grace for the recovery and restoration of man 466

LECTURE XIV.

PAGE

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Calvinistic scheme of interpretation, 3°. On the nature of spiritual influence. The language of the Fathers incompatible with the Calvinistic doctrine of irresistible grace. 4°. On election and reprobation. What the Fathers understood by the terms, foreknown, elect, predestined, saints. Their exposition of passages of Scripture relating to this subject. Prophecy, according to them, an evidence of the Divine Foreknowledge, yet not so as to control the contingency of events. Tenets akin to the Calvinistic ascribed by Origen to the Valentinians. His exposition of Rom. ix. 495

LECTURE XV.

Use of the Fathers in unfolding the *meaning* of Scripture: III. Prevailing mistake of applying a modern standard of interpretation to passages which should be explained by reference to an ancient one. The information, which the Fathers give, on early heresies, the true key to much of the New Testament. The method of Dr. Hammond substantially correct. Succession of heresies. Observation of Tertullian. Illustration of it from the writings of St. John. St. Paul explained with reference to the Gnostic heresy by Irenæus. Application of the same method by Tertullian. Further allusions to the doctrines and phraseology of the Gnostics discoverable in the Apostolical Epistles. IV. Interpretation of individual texts by the Fathers. Their comments not always to be relied on; yet often superior to those of modern days. Illustrations . . 507

Passages of Scripture explained or referred to 523

Index 526

LECTURES

ON THE

RIGHT USE OF THE EARLY FATHERS.

FIRST SERIES.

ON THE OBJECTIONS TO THE STUDY OF THE FATHERS
ADVANCED BY DAILLÉ AND BARBEYRAC.

"Qui divino theologiæ studio operam datis, qui chartis potissimum sacris impallescitis; qui venerandum sacerdotis officium aut occupatis aut ambitis; qui tremendam animarum curam suscepturi estis; excutite præsentis sæculi pruritum, fugite affectatam novitatem, quod fuit ab initio quærite, fontes consulite, ad antiquitatem confugite, ad sacros Patres redite, ad Ecclesiam primitivam respicite; h. e. ut cum prophetâ nostro loquar; *Interrogate de semitis antiquis*."—Bp. PEARSON. Concio I. Minor Theological Works, vol. ii. p. 6.

Ye who are devoting yourselves to the divine study of theology; ye who are growing pale over the sacred Scriptures above all; ye who either already occupy the venerable office of the priest, or aspire to do so; ye who are about to undertake the awful care of souls; put away from you the taste of the times; have nothing to do with the novelties that are in vogue; search how it was in the beginning; go to the fountain head; look to antiquity; return to the reverend Fathers; have respect unto the Primitive Church; that is, to use the words of the prophet I am handling, *Ask for the old paths.* Jer. vi. 16.

ON THE RIGHT USE

OF

THE EARLY FATHERS.

FIRST SERIES.

LECTURE I.

The study of the early Fathers recommended. Their testimony appealed to by the Church of England in the Prayer Book, in the Articles, in the Canons; and by the Reformers, *e. g.* Jewel, Philpot, Grindal. Decline of reverence for antiquity at the period of the Rebellion. Milton. Effect of the Revolution. Influence of foreign Reformers. Treatises of Daillé and Barbeyrac.

I DO not think that I shall be employing my time or yours ill, if I call your attention in a Course of Lectures to the *right* use of the *early* Fathers and the force of the objections made against them. It is true that when on former occasions I have produced an analysis of them successively, I have not lost sight of this object; and having completed the abstract of each, I have briefly shown the purposes such Father might serve, and the questions he might be made to illustrate. I have reason to hope that a more correct estimate of the merits and defects of these primitive authors has been formed, or is in the course of formation, amongst many of the younger students of this place. Still I cannot but observe, in mixing with society in the country, that the amount of real knowledge on this subject generally dispersed is very small—very small even amongst the clergy themselves—and the smallest

of all amongst such of them as deal in the loudest declamation against patristic authority, a subject still much misunderstood, and regarded with a jealousy altogether unreasonable.

Now whatever may be the case with the Protestant Churches on the Continent, nothing can be clearer than that the Reformed Church of England does refer her members very constantly to these Fathers; does make her appeals to them with great confidence; that Isaac Casaubon, in writing to Salmasius, Ep. 837, a passage quoted by Dr. Wordsworth in his very valuable Theophilus Anglicanus,[1] has reason to say, "Si me conjectura non fallit, totius Reformationis pars integerrima est in Angliâ, ubi cum studio veritatis viget studium antiquitatis." So that to treat them with contempt, which so many, and those even ministers of her communion do, is to act as much in violation of the spirit of that Church as others are represented by them to do, whose bias lies in another direction. I made this appear, some time ago, in two introductory Lectures to the study of the Fathers, which I published, as well as since, in many incidental remarks which have fallen from me in the course of my Lectures themselves. Without, therefore, repeating at full all the details I may have put you already in possession of, I shall still think it best to remind you, at the opening of this present series, of a few of the more undeniable tokens of this characteristic of our Church, her respect for antiquity, in order to justify myself in making the right use of the early Fathers, and the consideration due to the objections levelled at them, the express argument of a Course of Lectures; in order to show that in thus employing myself and you, I am acting strictly in accordance with the instructions she gives me, as a Professor in her schools; and in order to vindicate our own University (if vindication she wants) in causing the Fathers to be an element in the theological examination to which she now invites those amongst her students who have an intention of entering into Holy Orders.

You will find our Church, then, explaining the principles on which her Prayer Book is constructed, in the preface to it, in the following language:—First of all she remarks that "there was never anything by the wit of man so well devised, or so sure established, which in continuance of time hath not

[1] Part II. ch. v.

been corrupted: as, among other things, it may plainly appear by the Common Prayers in the Church, commonly called Divine Service. The first original and ground whereof, if a man would search out by the ancient Fathers, he shall find that the same was not ordained but of a good purpose, and for a great advancement of godliness." She then goes on to lament that for "these many years passed," (*i. e.* in Romish times) "this godly and decent order of the ancient Fathers hath been altered, broken, and neglected, by planting in uncertain stories and legends, with multitude of responds, verses, vain repetitions," &c. She then proceeds to announce that these inconveniences having been considered, "such an Order" (in the Common Prayer Book) was "set forth, whereby the same" were "redressed." And she concludes with recommending her Prayer Book as "an Order for Prayer, and for the reading of the Holy Scripture, much agreeable to the mind and purpose of the old Fathers, and a great deal more profitable and commodious, than that which of late was used." Such is the spirit in which our Prayer Book was compiled; and if you examine it in detail, you will perceive at once how very large a part, both of its liturgy and ceremonial—how many of its prayers and hymns—how much of its creeds—how great a proportion of its sacramental offices and rules—it owes to early antiquity.

The Articles, as not deriving their original construction from the same primitive date, but begun and perfected during the period of the Reformation itself, have naturally less of this primitive complexion, and consequently find greater favour than the Liturgy in the eyes of those who would have been better pleased, had our Reformation proceeded upon principles of more extreme Protestantism, and who would, therefore, be ready to adopt the Articles, and the Articles only, as the test of heresy; thus disintegrating the Prayer Book, and deposing the authority of that portion of it which, if any comparison is to be instituted between the several parts, certainly occupies the more direct channel of primitive tradition. It will be perceived, however, that though not formed expressly out of ancient models, they are to a very great degree consistent with ancient patristical precedent, and have been shown to correspond in the main, both in sentiment and phraseology, with the writings of the Primitive Church, both by Bishop

Beveridge in his notes on his Exposition of the Articles; by Welchman; more recently and more fully by Mr. Harvey[1]; and still more recently by Mr. Browne.[2] Nor, indeed, does the language itself of the Articles fail, occasionally at least, to point to this fact; sufficiently often, at any rate, to show that their compilers were not under the impression which now prevails among so many, that those writings are but dangerous edge-tools. Thus, in the 6th Article, we read of the "Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament," being those "of whose authority there was never any doubt in the Church;" of the Church reading "other books (as *Hierome* saith) for example of life and instruction of manners." In the 24th, of its being "repugnant to the Word of God, and the custom of the Primitive Church to have public Prayer in the Church, or to minister the Sacraments in a tongue not understanded of the people." In the 35th, of the Books of the Homilies containing "a godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times," the very plan of which Books of Homilies, be it remembered, from first to last, is to argue by appeals first to Scripture and then to the Fathers. It would be waste of time to give proofs of this. Such is the spirit of the Articles.

No wonder, therefore, that in the canons of 1571, it should be enjoined on preachers, "Concionatores," "First and foremost to take heed, that they do not teach anything in their sermons as though they would have it scrupulously held and believed by the people, save what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have gathered from that doctrine." Or that the Bishop in the Ordination Service for Priests, is instructed to inquire of the candidate who presents himself for imposition of hands, whether he will "be diligent in Prayers, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same"—what studies do help to such knowledge in the estimation of the Church being made sufficiently manifest by the canon just recited, which may be taken, indeed, as a comment on the Bishop's question. For though these canons may not be technically binding, howbeit subscribed by the Bishops of both provinces, and approved by

[1] Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Vindex Catholicus. Cantabrigiæ, m.dccc.xii.

[2] An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, by Edw. Harold Browne, M.A., 1850.

the Queen, but as it happened not ratified by her in form[1]; yet as coming out in the very year, 1571, when the Book of Articles was again solemnly approved by the Queen and Convocation, they may well be used to interpret the animus of the Church.

And as if the Church would herself, by her own authoritative teaching, give her ministers an example of the manner in which the knowledge of the primitive Fathers would enable them to maintain her cause against her enemies and gainsayers, and the way in which she would have it applied by them, she proposes in her 30th Canon to defend the use of the Cross in Baptism, alleging, amongst other arguments, that "the honour and dignity of the name of the Cross begat a reverend estimation even in the Apostles' times (for aught that is known to the contrary) of the sign of the Cross, which the Christians shortly after used in all their actions;" that they "signed therewith their children when they were christened, to dedicate them by that badge to his service, whose benefits bestowed upon them in Baptism the name of the Cross did represent;" that "this use of the sign of the Cross in Baptism was held in the Primitive Church, as well by the Greeks as the Latins, with one consent and great applause;" that if at that time "any had opposed themselves against it, they would certainly have been censured as enemies of the name of the Cross, and consequently of Christ's merits, the sign whereof they could no better endure;" that "this continual and general use of the sign of the Cross is evident by many testimonies of the ancient Fathers." And then, from the particular case under consideration passing on to the general principle, the canon continues, that "it must be confessed, that in process of time the sign of the Cross was greatly abused in the Church of Rome, especially after that corruption of popery had once possessed it;" but that "the abuse of a thing doth not take away the lawful use of it. Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that, as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies, which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds

[1] Grindal's Remains, edited for the Parker Society, p. 327.

of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders." And then reverting to the case which gave rise to these general remarks, the use of the Cross in Baptism, the canon proceeds, that accordingly, "for the very remembrance of the Cross, which is very precious to all them that rightly believe in Jesus Christ, and in the other respects mentioned, the Church of England hath retained still the sign of it in Baptism: following therein the Primitive and Apostolical Churches;" that "the use of the sign of the Cross in Baptism, being thus purged from all popish superstition and error, and reduced in the Church of England to the primary institution of it, upon those true rules of doctrine concerning things indifferent, which are consonant to the Word of God, and the judgment of all the *ancient Fathers*," it is "the part of every private man, both minister and other, reverently to retain the true use of it prescribed by public authority."

I have given the substance of this canon at greater length, as considering it a fair specimen of the line of argument which our Church suggests as the safe and judicious one for her ministers to take in dealing with popish antagonists, and as giving evidence of the impression she wishes her members to receive with respect to the principles of the Reformation, and the spirit with which she desires to animate them.

Accordingly, if you look at Jewel (to whose Apology you see this very canon refers, affording it, as it were, an indirect sanction), you will perceive throughout the work this same characteristic of the Reformation, a reverence for antiquity—his argument, the whole Apology through, adverting to the Primitive Church, to Scripture and the testimony of the Catholic Fathers, to the witness of the ancient Fathers and ancient Councils, to the model of primitive times, to the Church of the old Catholic Bishops and Fathers, for so continual are his allusions to this topic, that he has to ring all the changes he can think of on the terms, in order to relieve his style. Nor is there anything singular in the instance of Jewel. The reverence for antiquity is a feature, more or less marked, of the temperament of almost every member of the Church of England of that day, of whom we know anything at all. How, indeed, could it be otherwise? It was an inheritance to which

they succeeded. Instead of turning, as we do in these days, to a contemporary commentator, or to one who has not preceded us by more than a few generations, to a Hammond, a Patrick, a Whitby, a Henry, or a Scott; they as naturally took from their shelves an Augustine or a Jerome, a Basil or a Chrysostom, or some catena collected out of the works of these or other authors of a like date. Did they want a form of prayer? Instead of devising one for themselves, they betook themselves to the old liturgies, and based their own upon those. All the controversies that took place at the Reformation, and long afterwards, are deeply involved in the investigation of antiquity—it was a line of debate which none shrank from. It is a spirit foreign to that of the Reformation, and one that has sprung up since the Reformation, or at least which has gathered all its strength since that event, which is regardless of antiquity—a spirit which various causes have served to foster, which I may touch upon by and by—but as a practical and easy way of convincing yourselves that I am not misrepresenting the Reformers, turn to the series of works edited by the Parker Society, edited, no doubt, from a feeling that it was time, as it indeed was, to draw the country back to the contemplation of the sentiments of the Reformers, and so provide a caveat against the supposed increasing allurements of Rome. Is it then found, that because those Reformers resisted the Pope, and the abuses of the Church over which he presided, even to the death, they flinched from the test of antiquity? That they set themselves to disparage and vilify the Fathers, who are the witnesses of it? If any expected to discover this in them, they must by this time have perceived their mistake. No such disposition is theirs, but the contrary. I waive such an example as that of Ridley, one of the authors whose writings and dissertations that Society has published, and a very mainspring of the Reformation, indeed the ablest and the most learned, perhaps, of its leaders. I waive him, because he may be justly considered to have taken higher Church grounds than many others in that great movement, probably higher than those with whom he more immediately acted; and I content myself with those who had the reputation of being amongst the lowest and most liberal Churchmen of their time; and who on that account have ever been spoken of with tenderness, if not with

affection, by dissenters themselves. Even in these I observe a respect for patristic authority, such as would now expose the party who entertained it to reproach.

Thus, let us take the case of Philpot, the friend of Bradford[1]; the approver of the Church of Geneva, and the doctrine of the same[2]; the admirer of Calvin and of his Institutes[3]; one, therefore, we may be sure, who was no type of the High-Church party of his time. What, then, are the sentiments that we find him advocating with respect to the reverence due to antiquity, and to the Fathers its expositors? I give some of them in the order in which they occur in the publication itself.

"Why, do you not think that we have now the true faith?" is one of Bonner's questions to him. "I desire your Lordship to hold me excused for answering at this time—I am sure that God's Word thoroughly, with the *Primitive Church*, and all the ancient writings do agree with this faith I am of"—is Philpot's reply.[4]

"Take the book" (a copy of Irenæus) "Master Philpot, and look upon that place, and there may you see how the Church of Rome is to be followed of all men;" saith to him the Bishop of Gloucester.

Philpot takes the book, and sifts the passage[5] and then concludes, "but the Church of Rome hath swerved from that truth and simplicity of the Gospel, which it maintained in Irenæus's time, and was then uncorrupted from that which it is now: wherefore your Lordships cannot justly apply the authority of Irenæus to the Church of Rome now, which is so manifestly corrupted from the *Primitive Church.*"[6]

"I pray you," says the Bishop of Gloucester once more, "by whom will you be judged in matters of controversy which happen daily?"

"*Philpot.* By the Word of God. For Christ saith in St. John, the Word that He spake shall be judge in the latter day."

"*Gloucester.* What if you take the Word one way, and I another way? who shall be judge then?"

"*Philpot.* The Primitive Church."

[1] Philpot's Examinations and Writings, p. xiv.
[2] p. 153. [3] p. 46. [4] p. 17.
[5] Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 2.
[6] Philpot's Examinations, p. 25.

"*Gloucester.* I know you mean the Doctors that wrote thereof."

"*Philpot.* I mean verily so."[1]

"I pray you," saith the Bishop of Coventry, "can you tell what this word 'Catholic' doth signify? Shew, if you can."

"*Philpot.* Yes, that I can, I thank GOD. . . . I esteem the Catholic Church to be as St. Augustine defineth the same: 'We judge,' saith he, 'the Catholic faith, of that which hath been, is, and shall be.' So that, if you can be able to prove that your faith and Church hath been from the beginning taught, and is, and shall be, then may you count yourselves Catholic, otherwise not."[2]

"*All* the Catholic Church (until these few years)," saith the Bishop of St. Asaph, "have taken him" (the Bishop of Rome) "to be the supreme head of the Church, *besides* this good man Irenæus."

"*Philpot.* That is not likely, that Irenæus so took him, or the Primitive Church: for I am able to shew seven general Councils after Irenæus's time, wherein he was never so taken; which may be a sufficient proof, that the Catholic Primitive Church never took him for supreme head."[3]

"*Bishop of Coventry.* Why will you not admit the Church of Rome to be the Catholic Church?"

"*Philpot.* Because it followeth not the Primitive Catholic Church, neither agreeth with the same, no more than an apple is like a nut."

"*Coventry.* Wherein doth it dissent?"

"*Philpot.* It were too long to recite all; but two things I will name, the Supremacy, and Transubstantiation. . . . Transubstantiation is but a late plantation of the Bishop of Rome; and you are not able to shew any ancient writer, that the Primitive Church did believe any such thing."

"*Coventry.* How prove you that the Church of Rome now dissenteth in doctrine and use of the Sacraments from the Primitive Church?"

"*Philpot.* Compare the one with the other, and it shall soon appear; as you may see both in Eusebius and other *ecclesiastical and ancient writers.*"[4]

"*London.* How long hath your Church stood, I pray you?"

[1] Philpot's Examinations, p. 29. [2] pp. 37, 38. [3] p. 39. [4] p. 40.

"*Philpot.* Even from the beginning; from Christ, and from his Apostles, and from *their immediate successors.*"

"*Chancellor.* He will prove his Church to be before Christ!"

"*Philpot.* If I did so, I go not amiss: for there was a Church before the coming of Christ, which maketh one Catholic Church."

"*Chancellor.* It is so indeed."

"*Philpot.* I will desire no better rule than the same which is oftentimes brought in of your side, to prove both my faith and Church Catholic; that is, *antiquity*, universality and unity."

"*London.* Do you not see what a bragging foolish fellow this is? He would seem to be very well seen in the doctors, and he is but a fool. By what doctor art thou able to prove thy Church? Name him, and thou shalt have him."

"*Philpot.* My Lord, let me have all your ancient writers, with pen, and ink, and paper, and *I will prove both my faith and my Church out of every one of them.*" [1]

I had transcribed a good many passages from the writings of Philpot, as published by the Parker Society, to the same effect; and meant to have produced them all, but I fear it may weary you—possibly indeed you may think I have quoted more than enough already; but I have laid these before you, because in the first place I bear in mind, when composing these Lectures, that some of my hearers are young, and have not yet had time to make themselves masters of points in theology which are very familiar to older heads; and I would rather be too copious than too concise, for the sake of those to whose use these Lectures are chiefly dedicated —and furthermore I have so done, because I could not otherwise adequately possess any of you with the conviction, how entirely the Church of the Reformation, so far from abandoning or contemning the early Fathers, claimed them for her own, and argued from them not incidentally and by the bye, but systematically and perseveringly, producing them in her controversies without stint or reserve; and not only the higher Churchmen, but the very lowest and most latitudinarian, adopting this practice.

Take the case of another of the divines of that day, whose

[1] Philpot's Examinations, p. 73.

remains have been also edited by the same Society, Archbishop Grindal; and whom I select for the same reason as I did Philpot, his strong anti-high-church bias; though, to say the truth, his letters on the one hand, and his injunctions or articles of inquiry to his clergy and others on the other, often leave us a little at a loss to discover by what steady principle of conduct he was governed. Without, however, entering into these particulars, suffice it to say in a word, for it conveys much in little, that he, like Philpot, was an admirer of Calvin. "Accedit etiam, uti ais," he writes to Zanchius, "Domini Calvini calculus, qui subscriptionem tuam cum illis conditionibus et exceptionibus approbavit: quod me multum confirmat: nam illius judicio multum soleo tribuere." "The opinion of Master Calvin, moreover, as you say, is with you; who approved of your subscription under those conditions and exceptions; which much confirms me: for I am wont to pay much deference to his opinion."[1] Yet even he, in his "fruitful dialogue between Custom and Verity," on the sense of the words, "This is my body," one of the few things he left in print, deals in language from time to time such as the following.

"Wherefore first," says Verity, "I will declare the meaning of these words, 'This is my body;' and next in what sense the Church and the old Fathers have evermore taken them."[2]

Again. "But you will say, these are worldly reasons. What, then, if the old Fathers record the same? Irenæus saith, 'Quando mixtus calix et fractus panis percipit verbum Dei, fit Eucharistia corporis et sanguinis Domini, ex quibus augetur et consistit carnis nostræ substantia.'"[3]

Again. "Tush," says Custom, "what speak you of the Word of God? There be many dark sayings therein, which every man cannot attain to."

"*Verity.* I grant you, there be certain obscure places in the Scripture; yet not so obscure, but that a man with the grace of God may perceive: for it was written not for angels, but for men. But, as I understand, Custom meddleth but little with Scripture. How say you by St. Augustine, St. Jerome, St. Ambrose? What, if they stand on our side?"

[1] Grindal's Remains, pp. 276, 277. [2] p. 40. [3] p. 47.

"*Custom.* No, no; I know them well enough."

"*Verity.* So well as you know them, for all old acquaintance, if they be called to witness, they will give evidence against you."[1]

Again. "*Custom.* The doctors and old writers, men inspired with the Holy Ghost, have evermore been against your doctrine: yea, and in these days, the wisest men and best learned call you heretics and your learning heresy."

"*Verity.* As touching the old writers, I remember well they speak reverently of the Sacraments, like as every man ought to do; but whereas they deliver their mind with their right hand, you, Custom, receive it with the left. For whereas they say, that it is the body of Christ, and that it must be verily eaten, meaning that it doth effectually lay before the eyes Christ's body, and that it is to the faithful man no less than if it were Christ himself, and that Christ must be eaten in faith, not torn nor rent with the teeth; you say that, howsoever it be taken, it is Christ's body, and that there is none other eating but with the mouth. And that the Fathers meant no other thing than I have said, it shall appear by their words."[2]

And again, after a while: "What is so heinous in these days, as to call the Sacrament the token, or the remembrance of Christ's body? Yet did the old writers in manner never call it other. Tertullian, in the fourth book against the Marcionites,"[3] &c.

And, after many authorities cited in proof of this proposition, it is added: "Hereby you may understand how and in what sort the *old Fathers*, how *the Primitive and beginning Church*, how the Apostles, how Christ himself, took these words, 'This is my body.' Now, to withstand, and stoutly to go against, not only *ancient writers*, or the congregation of Christian people, which at that time was not overgrown, no, neither spotted with covetousness and worldly honour, but the Apostles also, and God himself, no doubt it is great fondness."[4]

And the whole Dialogue is summed up in these terms following: "Thus, so shortly, and in so few words as I could, I

[1] Grindal's Remains, p. 52. [2] p. 63. [3] p. 64. [4] p. 72.

have declared to you what Christ meant by these words, 'This is my body;' what the Apostles taught therein, and in what sort they delivered them to their successors; in what sense and meaning the holy Fathers and old writers, and the Universal and Catholic Church, hath evermore taken them."[1]

This reverence for antiquity, however, this appeal to the Primitive Church, this respect for the Fathers, its witnesses—so characteristic of the Reformation, as carried on in England—was, by degrees, worn out; several causes, as I have said, concurring to efface it; some of a violent, some of a more insidious kind. Of the first of these kinds was the great Rebellion, which took the form of a religious contest, and was conducted by the triumphant party on principles entirely opposed to those which the Fathers are calculated to uphold. The tendency of their teaching, as to the state, is passive obedience; for, though many of them living and writing under emperors who were persecutors of the Church, they manifest no disposition whatever to resist them, or to persuade others to do so. They content themselves with making appeals to their sense of justice; with disabusing them of many misconceptions, with respect to the Christians, under which they laboured; with praying for them; and defending in general the faith and practice of Christians; and with reminding the Christians that the powers which were ordained of God were adapted to the times in which they governed—good rulers sent for the benefit of a good generation; evil rulers for the correction of a bad one; but both sent by God.[2] Again, as to the Church, their tendency was clear for three orders of the ministry; an Apostolical succession; definite creeds; strict unity; as we shall see in the sequel of these Lectures. How could the impatient spirits which worked out the great Rebellion find satisfaction in authors like these?

Accordingly, for the matter of fact, look at Milton—not an unfair type, surely, of his party; not the coarse fanatic, which was the material of which so large a portion of the Puritans was composed, who had few early associations, whether of literature or of birth, to soften him; but one who had ever himself a certain feeling for ages gone by, and the monuments they had left us.

[1] Grindal's Remains, p. 74.

[2] Irenæus, V. c. xxiv. § 3.

"But let my due feet never fail
To walk the studious cloyster's pale,
And love the high embowed roof,
With antick pillars massy proof,
And storied windows richly dight,
Casting a dim religious light:
There let the pealing organ blow,
To the full-voic'd quire below,
In service high, and anthems clear,
As may with sweetness, through mine ear,
Dissolve me into ecstasies,
And bring all heaven before mine eyes."

I say that a man who, at any period of his life, could write in this spirit, may be taken as, at least, no exaggerated type of the Puritan, and of the ecclesiastical sentiments which animated him. How, then, does Milton speak of the Fathers, howbeit in this general invective giving no indication of any close knowledge or acquaintance with them? Turn we to his "Treatise of Prelatical Episcopacy."

"Notwithstanding this clearness, and that by all evidence of argument, Timothy and Titus, whom our prelates claim to imitate only in the controlling part of their office, had rather the vicegerency of an Apostleship committed to them, than the ordinary charge of a Bishopric, as being men of an extraordinary calling; yet, to verify that which St. Paul foretold of succeeding times, when men began to have itching ears; then, not contented with the plentiful and wholesome fountains of the Gospel, they began, after their own lusts, to heap to themselves teachers; and, as if the Divine Scripture wanted a supplement, and were to be eked out, they cannot think any doubt resolved, and any doctrine confirmed, unless they run to that undigested heap and fry of authors, which they call antiquity. Whatsoever time, or the heedless hand of blind chance, hath drawn down from of old to this present, in her huge drag-net, whether fish or sea-weed, shells or shrubs, unpicked, unchosen, those are *the Fathers*. Seeing, therefore, some men, deeply conversant in books, have had so little care of late to give the world a better account of their reading than by divulging needless tractates, stuffed with the specious names of Ignatius and Polycarpus; with fragments of old martyrologies and legends, to distract and stagger the multitude of credulous readers, and mislead them from their strong guards and places of safety, under the tuition of Holy Writ; it came into my thoughts to persuade myself, setting all

distances and nice respects aside, that I could do religion and my country no better service for the time, than doing my utmost endeavour to recall the people of God from this vain foraging after straw, and to reduce them to their firm stations under the standard of the Gospel; by making appear to them, first, the insufficiency; next, the inconveniency; and, lastly, the impiety of these gay testimonies, that their great doctors would bring them to dote on."[1]

And, again, in his Dissertation "Of Reformation in England:" "Such were these that must be called the ancientest and most virgin times between Christ and Constantine. Nor was this general contagion in their actions and not in their writings. Who is ignorant of the foul errors, the ridiculous wresting of Scripture, the heresies, the vanities thick-sown through the volumes of J. Martyr, Clemens, Origen, Tertullian, and others of eldest time?"[2]

Moreover, how entirely Milton was impressed with the notion, that the Reformers, properly so called, were governed by feelings on this particular question, entirely opposed to his own and those of his party, is manifest from another passage in the same tract—a passage, which actually, and, in some degree, even unjustly, confounds the Reformers with the Fathers—so far is Milton, at least, from having discovered, as many now do, that they are utter antagonists; the one, all that we can admire; the other, all that we should eschew.

"And here withal I invoke the Immortal Deity, Revealer and Judge of all secrets, that, wherever I have in this book plainly and roundly (though worthily and truly) laid open the faults and blemishes of *Fathers*, *Martyrs*, or Christian Emperors, or have otherwise inveighed against the error and superstition with vehement expressions, I have done it neither out of malice, nor list to speak evil, nor any vainglory, but of mere necessity to vindicate the spotless truth from an ignominious bondage, whose native worth is now become of such low esteem, that she is like to find small credit with us for what she can say, unless she can bring a ticket from *Cranmer*, *Latimer*, and *Ridley*; or prove herself a retainer of Constantine, and wear his badge. More tolerable it were for the Church of God that all these names were utterly abolished,

[1] Milton's Prose Works, vol. i. pp. 32, 33, Birch's ed. [2] Vol. i. p. 9.

like the brazen serpent, than that man's fond opinion should thus idolize them, and the heavenly truth be thus captivated."[1]

If there be those who sympathize with the great poet in his estimate of the Fathers, are they prepared to join him too in the price he thus sets on the Reformers of our Church? After contemplating his case, should they not rather be induced to suspect, that the same party who are adverse to the one (whether conscious of the fact or not), are, in truth, adverse to both; and would be found to be so, were the turbulent times in which Milton wrote, and which removed restraints and reserve, to return, and all disguise to cease? The crisis, however, of the great Rebellion, which was one of extreme violence, naturally called forth in corresponding strength the principles that were antagonistic to it; so that if there was then a large and headstrong party who thus despised antiquity, and set at nought all reverence for patristical testimony, there was also a most learned and able body of divines, who vindicated both—some of the greatest our Church has ever known. To such men as these, and their efforts, allusion is made by Milton in the extracts I have read to you. They may be supposed to have had the advantage in the controversy; for they had far the most knowledge of the particular kind required for it on their side[2]; so that, had the cause of antiquity been subjected to no further assault, it would have recovered from this shock.

But, after a while, came on the Revolution; an event which shed a much more disastrous influence on the taste for patristical learning, because a more enduring and insidious one, than the Rebellion. "What we did at the Revolution," says Dr. Johnson, "was necessary; but it broke our constitution."[3] Much more might he have said, it broke our Church, which, however, was possibly what he meant. Henceforward a Presbyterian form of Church government was to be recognised and supported by the law of the land in one division of the Island, as clearly as the Episcopalian in the other. The King and

[1] Milton's Prose Works, vol. i. pp. 4, 5.

[2] Milton, indeed, publishing his treatise of Reformation expressly "to help the Puritans, who were," he says, "inferior to the Prelates in learning."—Johnson's Lives of the English Poets, vol. i. p. 98.

[3] Boswell's Life of Johnson, vol. v. p. 50, 8vo. 1831.

Parliament were henceforward taught to halt between the two; and the great landed proprietors who had estates in both countries, or even private persons who were connected with both by ties of marriage or of trade, were neutralized upon questions of ecclesiastical polity, which would heretofore have been thought vital, and of which the Fathers were the undeniable witnesses. The Non-jurors were the representatives of the old Church feelings of the country; and became, in consequence of their sentiments, now out of fashion, dislocated from a generation which had no sympathy with them; carrying away with them (though not entirely) that regard for primitive times, which with them was destined by degrees almost to expire. Convocation, which might have tended to keep it somewhat alive, by encouraging a learned clergy, and by bringing habitually before the laity ecclesiastical topics, which, from the long absence of such a monitor, have now faded so entirely from their minds as simply to call forth, if by chance produced, their supercilious dismissal—Convocation soon ceased to have a voice. The Church sunk into the Establishment; and the fruits of the change soon began to discover themselves. By the time of Wesley, the high and holy spirits, which had once animated it, had so far degenerated into the secular, that some revival of it was seen to be plainly necessary. But it was attempted in an age when the ancient ways were forgotten; and, consequently, in a spirit new and revolutionary. The old Catholic usages (as distinguished from the popish), instead of being sought out again, and quickened into wholesome action, were set at nought, and a system then devised, vigorous for the day, but which, having no foundations laid in the depth of time and sacred precedent, has long since given tokens of decrepitude and decay; and so far as it is likely to survive at all, seems destined to do so as a schism. It has had, however, its effect on the Church itself; and has helped to harden many even of its clergy in that contempt, or at least dislike, for antiquity and its witnesses, which the other events I have touched on had so grievously engendered already.

These were all causes acting to the disadvantage of the Fathers and the disparagement of antiquity within ourselves. There is one more which I shall name, that operated from

without to the same result; and that is, the character of the Reformed Churches abroad, and the influence it indirectly exerts on the ecclesiastical spirit of our own country. The sympathies of those Churches (as Clarendon tells us[1]) went along with the Puritans in the civil wars, and, no doubt, have attended the Dissenters ever since; and the works, that have issued from them, have been confessedly composed to damage the credit of the Fathers, who were utterly adverse to much of their polity. Some of these works were written with great ability and knowledge of the subject, but with all the prejudice of the partisan. And no books probably have contributed more to depreciate the Fathers, even in this country, than Daillé's treatise on the "Right Use" of them, and Barbeyrac's on their "Morality." Daillé's treatise has been circulated with great industry. Though written originally in French, it was translated into the universal language of Latin (a translation revised and supplied with additional matter by the author himself), to give it unrestrained currency,[2] as well as into local languages. It probably had its effect, even on such men as Chillingworth, and contributed to give his theology the bias it has.[3] It certainly has been read by thousands who have never troubled themselves to look into a page of the Fathers for themselves; nor, after reading it, would they perhaps feel much inclination to do so; yet, without reading the Fathers, it is impossible to see the unfairness of Daillé's arguments; and I well remember that all the early years of my life, my impression of these authors was wholly that which Daillé had given me; as almost all the labours of my later years have tended to efface it. I shall not, therefore, think my pains misemployed, if I devote the series of Lectures I shall deliver this term to remarks on this popular treatise of Daillé, "De Vero Usu Patrum," and on the other of Barbeyrac, so far as they affect the credit of the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, especially as I shall thus have a con-

[1] History of the Rebellion, vol. ii. p. 95. Oxf. 1720.

[2] Joannis Dallæi de usu patrum ad ea definienda religionis capita quæ sunt hodie controversa libri duo, Latinè è Gallico nunc primum à J. Mettayero redditi; ab auctore recogniti, *aucti*, et emendati. Genevæ, 1656. The Latin, therefore should seem to be the better work to refer to.

[3] See Churton's Life of Bp. Pearson, prefixed to his Minor Theological Works, p. lxxiii.

venient opportunity of clearing away *in limine* certain objections to the study of the Fathers, which one constantly hears alleged, for they comprise nearly all; and, at the same time, whilst clearing away these objections, I shall be preparing you for going along with me—those amongst you, at least, who are so disposed—when, in the next term, I shall lay before you the *positive advantages* of that study.

LECTURE II.

Division of Daillé's treatise into two heads. His first argument in support of his first proposition. Unfairness of it. Discussion of a passage in Eusebius. Fragments of the early Fathers collected by Dr. Routh. Illustrations of their value. Second argument of Daillé. Incidental allusions to important topics in the Fathers, overlooked by him. Their evidence not to be gathered without careful study. Illustration of this in establishing the doctrine and ritual of the Church. And in the Romish controversy, *e. g.* on Transubstantiation, the Papal Supremacy, Auricular Confession, Image Worship.

I PROPOSE, in the present Lecture, to redeem the promise I made in the last, and offer you some remarks on the celebrated treatise of Daillé, a distinguished minister of the French Protestant Church (published in 1631), on "The Right Use of the Fathers."

Daillé divides his treatise into two general heads. First, asserting that the testimony of the Fathers, owing to various causes which he enumerates, is vague, uncertain, and obscure. And, secondly, that, were it more clear and decisive, it is not of such authority as to settle our controversies; the latter of the two divisions very much anticipated by the other.

In support of the former proposition, he sets out with affirming, in terms of some exaggeration, the paucity of the writings of the first three centuries; and quotes a passage from the beginning of Eusebius' History to prove in general, before he proceeds to details, that very few persons in those early times addicted themselves to composing books.[1] But it will be found, on reference to Eusebius, that he does not say there were few or no books then written; but that there were none written on the plan he was proposing to adopt—in fact no ecclesiastical history or regular Church annals, which would serve him for a precedent. For, having described the various topics his own history was meant to embrace, he proceeds to

[1] Daillé, p 4.

propitiate his readers towards any defects which they might discover in it; saying, "that his subject now required him to ask the candid construction of the considerate; for that it was a thing, he confessed, beyond his powers to promise a narrative perfect and lacking nothing; seeing that he was the first person that had engaged in that particular argument; and so had to *tread a road desert and unbeaten*" (the clause adduced by Daillé); "however, that his prayer was, he might have God for his Guide, and the power of the Lord to work with him, for that of men who had travelled the same way before him (*τὴν αὐτὴν ἡμῖν προωδευκότων ὁδὸν*) he could find no trace; save only a few materials, by which one or other had left him some partial information of the times in which they themselves lived." And, again, a little afterwards, repeating nearly the same words, he continues, "that he accounted it the more necessary for him to undertake the labour he was about, because he knew no ecclesiastical writer who had as yet troubled himself about that particular department of literature,"[1] meaning the department of ecclesiastical history. The thing is worth observing, because the bias of Daillé is thus made to appear by the turn he gives to a passage of Eusebius on the very threshold of his work.

Nor is that bias less apparent in what follows; for postponing for a while any emphatic mention of the writings of the first three centuries, which have come down to us entire, or nearly so, he proceeds studiously to draw attention to the *fragments* of the early Fathers which have survived—as if, of the few works we have of the Primitive Church, scarcely anything but fragments remained. And, accordingly, he gives a list of authors whose bare names and titles (says he) have been preserved by Eusebius, Jerome, and others.[2] Doubtless the remains of several of those authors (the catalogue of which, by the bye, his readers will perceive to be much larger than Daillé's previous proposition might have led them to expect) are inconsiderable in bulk, compared with the entire works of which they formed a part: but they are often of great value, nevertheless; and are very far from being mere names and

[1] *Μηδένα πω εἰς δεῦρο τῶν ἐκκλησιαστικῶν συγγραφέων διέγνων περὶ τοῦτο τῆς γραφῆς σπουδὴν πεποιημένον τὸ μέρος.*—Euseb. Eccles. Hist. i. c. 1.

[2] Quorum nuda nobis nomina et tituli apud Eusebium et Hieronymum et alios supersunt.—p. 5.

titles. They have been collected, as you are aware, from various quarters in which they are scattered, by Dr. Routh, and, together with the notes on them, as edited by him, are enough to occupy four octavo volumes: those which had been previously got together by Grabe, in his "Spicilegium," in two volumes, having been mixed up with much that is apocryphal. The venerable President of Magdalene College, instead of describing them, as Daillé does, as mere names and titles, regards them as documents throwing great light on points in the Primitive Church that were otherwise obscure; and as worthy of all acceptation from their piety, learning, and authority. "Quoniam autem mihi in animo fuit, statum primævæ ecclesiæ et dogmata et mores ex ipsius, pro facultate meâ, investigare monimentis, scripta omnia sanctiorum ætatum legenda esse censui. Et vero, quod nihil omnino in hoc genere prætermittere statuerim, id plurimum contulisse ad obscuriora quædam clarius intelligenda sæpe sum expertus. Certe tot negligere Scriptores, quamvis mutilatos nimium, haud oportuisset, quorum reliquiæ pietate, doctrinâ, auctoritate, nobis commendatissimæ sunt."[1] And assuredly, an examination of the fragments themselves supports his estimate of them.

Take, for instance, the fragments of the writings of Dionysius of Corinth (one of the cases Daillé produces), as found in Eusebius. We learn from them, short as they are, that Rome was even then a wealthy Church; able to lay poor Churches under pecuniary obligation to her; and accustomed to do so from the most early times. That the Epistle of Clemens to the Church of Corinth was held in such respect as to be then read in the Church of Corinth. That the Church of Corinth and the Church of Rome had the same Apostles for their founders, Peter and Paul, who both suffered martyrdom at the same time at Rome. That there were those then abroad who had the audacity to corrupt not only Epistles written to Churches by the Bishops, but the Scriptures themselves. That there were then existing Churches at Lacedæmon, at Athens, at Nicomedia, at Gortyna, and other parts of Crete, at Amastris, at Gnossus. That the Bishops of those Churches were such and such persons; and that, in some instances, they stood in the relation to one another of Prelate

[1] Reliq. Sacr. Præf. vol. i. p. viii.

and Metropolitan—information certainly of much value, and amounting to much more than a mere name and title.

So again, take the case of Hegesippus, another of the instances cited by Daillé. In the fragments, which have reached us, of his work, we have a minute and interesting account of the character and death of James the Just; of his abstemious habits; of his ascetic devotions; of his influence with the people; of the plot framed against him by the Scribes and Pharisees; of his testimony to the Saviour; of the circumstances of his martyrdom—how he was cast down from the Temple, then stoned, then beaten with the fuller's club. We have further some very curious particulars of the last survivors of the family of Our Lord: two old men grandsons of St Jude, in the days of Domitian, possessed of no other property than a small estate, which they cultivated with their own hands; and living till the age of Trajan. We further learn from the same source the state of the Churches established in various quarters, which Hegesippus had personally visited; the general soundness of their faith; the uniformity of their teaching; the succession of their Bishops—all this very far from being fairly described under the designation of mere "name and title."

The fragments of some other authors, who are mentioned in Daillé's catalogue, are even more copious in their information than these, but it would be tedious to produce them all. I must therefore beg you to satisfy yourselves of the fact by reading them in the "Reliquiæ Sacræ" for yourselves. Whilst in the instance of Hippolytus, who, again, is another of the authors included in the list of Daillé, as having left us fragments that amount to no more than a mere name and title, we have not only passages of considerable length from a variety of his works, such as commentaries on different books of Scripture, particularly the Psalms, homilies, local histories, but also whole treatises; as one concerning Christ and Antichrist; another on the Patripassian heresy of Noetus, having much in common with Tertullian adversus Praxeam, and yielding (besides much else that is valuable) many clear testimonies to the Divinity of the Son, as well as to the doctrine of the Trinity; another, a homily probably, for it seems to have been addressed to an audience, on the Baptism of the Saviour, and like the last affording the strongest evidence that the Godhead

of the Son was a doctrine of the Primitive Church, and giving clear proof that the Sacrament of Baptism was, in the estimation of the Primitive Church, the same holy and emphatic ordinance which it is always represented to be in our own.

Neither does Daillé here take any notice of the Apostolical Constitutions, as they are called, and Canons of early date, which may still survive, and which may perhaps be regarded as consisting, though not exclusively consisting, of materials that belong to the period over which his observations extend. For though there is abundant internal evidence in those Constitutions, that they were not compiled into eight books, which is the form they now wear, till after the Church had been strongly established and dominant, even emperors subject to her; yet there are, on the other hand, indications not to be mistaken, of much of their substance being of a date most remote, perhaps Apostolical. Thus observe the very large share of their attention, which is occupied by the heathen; by the prescriptions necessary for regulating the conduct of the Christian in his carriage towards them in the various relations of life; provision made for the case of mixed marriages; for the case of master and servant being heathen and Christian; for the case of heathen festivals, heathen tribunals, heathen evidence, heathen theatres, heathen processions, heathen markets—all of them furnishing subjects for canonical prohibition or caution. We find the persecutions and scoffs of the heathen constantly brought under consideration: the relapse to heathenism of Christians, who fancied themselves aggrieved by the Church, guarded against: the obstacles thrown in the way of public worship, and the consequent necessity of repairing to private houses for social devotion, noticed: the number of Gentile proselytes: the mean condition of the Christian community. All these are features of the very early date of those portions at least of the Constitutions which deal with such particulars, however there may be other portions connected with them which betray a later age. And assuredly a very great amount of information on the state of the Primitive Church is to be derived from a judicious and discriminating investigation of these remains.

But after all the disparagement to which Daillé had subjected the fragments of the Fathers, both as to their bulk and contents, there still are left for him to dispose of, a good many

entire volumes of their works; those even before the Council of Nice, as usually edited, not being fewer than twelve folios; and accordingly he advances a second argument, that from the nature of the subjects treated by the Fathers of the first three centuries, they have *no reference whatever to present controversies*.[1] Whereupon he enumerates the several Treatises of these early authors. Justin and Tertullian, Theophilus and Lactantius, Clemens and Arnobius, teach the vanity of the reputed gods; show that Jupiter, Mars, Juno, &c., were mere mortals, and that there is but one true God, the Creator of heaven and earth. Irenæus puts to the rout the foul and foolish theories of Basilides, the Valentinians, and the other Gnostics. Tertullian refutes these same heretics, and others besides them, Marcion, Hermogenes, Apelles, Praxeas, and such as maintain two gods, or two principles, and confound the person of the Father and the Son. Cyprian is almost entirely occupied in fostering the discipline and virtues of the Christian Church; and so on. And he triumphantly asks, What has all this to do with Transubstantiation—with the adoration of the Host—with the supremacy of the Pope—with the necessity of secret confession—with the worship of images; or with other matters agitated nowadays[2]? But how evident is it, that all this is directed to persons, who are to know nothing of the Fathers, except through his report! How far from an honest and ingenuous view of them is this!

In the first place, how utterly imperfect and defective is even this *table of contents* of the Fathers; probably not embracing even a tenth part of the subjects which they directly profess to handle; several of them, too, subjects of keen controversy still. But setting this consideration aside, and even supposing for argument's sake, that Daillé's catalogue of contents is complete; he was sufficiently read in the Fathers to know how totally inadequate an idea of the multifarious subjects, on which they either treat or touch, would be got from a mere table of contents. Indeed, if there is one thing more than another characteristic of these writers, it is this: the vast magazine of most valuable information they communicate to us quite incidentally and by the bye, a single chapter perhaps, or a single sentence of a chapter, or some-

[1] A quibus (sc. controversiis hodiernis) planè sunt aliena, quæ veteres in suis illis operibus tractant. —p. 8.

[2] pp. 8, 9.

times even a single expression in a sentence, occurring in a treatise of which the bare title promises nothing of the sort, furnishing us with the most interesting knowledge of some point or other of doctrine, discipline, ritual, or usage of the Church of the day, and taking us quite by surprise—insomuch that no writers whatever will bear skipping, even for a line, so ill as these. A desultory reader of the Fathers, nay, a reader who is not the most patient and precise, and always on the watch, can never be sure that he has not suffered some paragraph or phrase to escape, which would in itself have repaid him for the perusal of the whole book. Nay, perhaps it is necessary that his mind should be rendered sensitive to such subjects, by living in times of controversy like our own, in order that he may detect in them all that they contain. And accordingly I think I can discover in some careful and able investigators of the works of the Fathers, but whose researches happened to be carried on when the Church was quiescent, that they have left many hints of great value unimproved, unperceived—the moment not propitious to the seizure and application of them. Indeed, a slovenly mode of study, as I am sure the audience I am addressing will admit, is safe with no works whatever; but with those of the Fathers, I must repeat, it is the most unsafe of all, owing to the little method observed in almost all of them, and the utter absence of it in some; so that Bishop Horsley might well take advantage, as he does, of Dr. Priestley's inadvertent admission, that he was in the habit of "looking through" books, and might well feel strengthened in the line of argument he had adopted with that antagonist, namely, to waive the merits of the question itself, and contend that Dr. Priestley was incompetent from ignorance of his authors, who were of a kind not to bear "looking through," to engage in the discussion of it. In these remarks I am sure that any of my hearers, who have accustomed themselves to this department of study, would at once acquiesce; but for the benefit of those who have not, I will produce a few examples.

Justin Martyr, according to Daillé, is employed in denouncing the folly of idol worship, exposing the mere humanity of Jupiter, Mars, &c., and asserting and enforcing the unity of the true God. And though this may indeed be reckoned the bare outline of his Apologies, and serve as a title to them; we

meet with much in those Apologies which comes under no such head. For instance, we there stumble upon a very accurate account, the earliest we possess, of the manner in which public worship was conducted by the Christians on Sundays—the several parts of the Service—the reading of the Scriptures—the Common Prayer, even some of the clauses of the Prayers—the office for the Communion—even one minute feature of that office, the use of the Lord's Prayer, in the consecration.[1] The whole a passage of no great length, but pregnant with conclusions the most valuable to all, who feel a reverence for primitive ecclesiastical usage.[2]

Again, the Pædagogue of Clemens Alexandrinus contains a number of precepts which the Pædagogue (who gives a name to the treatise) is supposed to impart to his pupil as he takes him to school. These precepts relate to the application of Christian principles (for the pupil is supposed to be a convert from heathenism), to the various habits and customs of ordinary life. Accordingly, regulations of the dress, and decoration of the person, constitute the subject of one chapter. Now, who would expect to find in such a place evidence for the practice of Infant Baptism? Yet such is the case. The Pædagogue is speaking of the lawfulness of wearing seals: he would have them worn for use, not for ornament; expressly for the purpose of securing matters that require safe keeping. He then goes on to say what device he would have engraved on them; and recommends a dove, or a fish, or a ship under sail, or a lyre, or an anchor; or, he adds, if the party be a fisherman, he will remember the Apostle *and the children who are drawn up out of the water* (*καὶ τῶν ἐξ ὕδατος ἀνασπωμενων παιδίων*[3])—a reference, apparently, to the words of Jesus to his disciples, "Follow me, and I will make you fishers of men," yet a passage so expressed, as to take into account the means by which this was to be effected, even by administering the Rite of Baptism, and *Infant* Baptism. Surely this is a subject of controversy not foreign to our own times! So, again, when he is afterwards speaking of the application of cosmetics to the complexion, a practice which he condemns, his argument leads him to express a clear opinion on the active

[1] *Τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστθεῖσαν τροφήν.*—Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 66.

[2] § 67.

[3] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xi. p. 289. Potter's ed.

influence of the Spirit on the heart of the Christian.[1] Yet this would not have been exactly the quarter in which we should have thought of looking for an enunciation of that doctrine.

Take another instance. Irenæus is occupied, Daillé tells us in refuting the Valentinians, the Basilidians, and other Gnostics—and, no doubt, the heretical speculations, that he has thus to contend against, are to the last degree absurd and childish, and very little like any which we should have to encounter in our own day. Are we then to lay Irenæus aside, under the conviction that his argument is no concern of ours? We should lose a vast deal of information on matters in which we ourselves take a deep interest, were we to do so; however little we may have in common with the general object of the book. Thus, the heretics, with whom he had to deal, vindicated many of their senseless tenets by the authority of tradition. Irenæus, therefore, meets them on their own ground; challenges tradition, provided it be genuine, as utterly against them, being coincident with Scripture, and the doctrines of the Church: he therefore prescribes the circumstances which were necessary to guarantee the truth of tradition, that it should be found to be uniform in the several Churches, which the Apostles had founded, and which Bishops had continued to preside over in regular succession, since the Apostles' days, down to his own; at the same time producing a catalogue of these Bishops in the Church of Rome, and only abstaining from doing so in other Churches, out of fear of wearying his readers.[2] All this is in refutation of certain silly fancies of the heretics he was encountering. But does a passage of this sort touch no controversies of our own age, and is the author, to whom it belongs, of no value, because he is only employed on Valentinus and his Æons? Nay, the mention of these very Æons on one occasion, furnishes an example of the kind we are now in search of, and much to our present purpose. For these Gnostics, looking about them for arguments to support them in their notion of their Æons, find one, Irenæus tells us, in an expression of St. Paul, Ephes. iii. 21, *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενεὰς τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*, and another even in the language of the orthodox themselves, who when they say at the Eucharist, *εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας τῶν αἰώνων*, have

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xi. p. 291.

[2] Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 3.

an eye (they contend) to these Æons[1]; a most absurd argument of the parties who used it, no doubt, yet clearly showing, however inadvertently, that there was a set form of Service for the Holy Communion in the time of Irenæus, so well known as to require a mere allusion to it in order to be understood; and which, therefore, must have descended from more ancient times still: a fact concurrent with what had previously dropped from Justin. Have casual passages of this kind, and the Fathers abound in them, nothing to do with the controversies of the present day, and may the authors in which they are deposited be safely neglected, because their title-pages happen to promise nothing of the sort? It cannot be supposed that Daillé was ignorant of this feature of patristic literature; for it is scarcely possible to read a score of pages in any department of it, which do not betray it.

I shall give you other examples of it still, because I am anxious to impress on you, that this remark in refutation of Daillé does not apply to one or two of the Fathers only, but to them all, and I multiply them the rather, because in the process I shall be still unfolding to you features of the Primitive Church. One of Tertullian's tracts is entitled, "On the Crown," De Coronâ, a tract, to which the following incident gave occasion. At a Donation of the emperor's, one of the soldiers appeared without a wreath or chaplet on his head; holding it instead in his hand, and thereby confessing himself to be a Christian. He is accordingly treated as one, and sentence is passed on him. Tertullian then undertakes to discuss the question, whether the man should have submitted to wear the wreath or not; and determines it in the negative. I have nothing to do with the merits of the argument, or the religious sentiments of Tertullian when he penned it. I simply ask whether the title is such as would seem to hold out any promise of the various topics touched or handled in the treatise. For I find in it many particulars relating to the administration of the Rite of Baptism—reference to promises and vows as even then formally made in it, similar apparently to those exacted by our own Church at this day, a renunciation of the devil and his pomps, for such is the phrase used.[2] I further find it speaking of the Eucharist; the time of its

[1] Irenæus, I. c. iii. § 1.

[2] Contestamur nos renuntiare diabolo, et pompæ, et angelis ejus.—Tertullian, De Coronâ, c. iii.

celebration; the manner in which it was communicated to all, as we may infer, in both kinds; the officiating minister, an ecclesiastic.[1] I find it referring to the celebration of the anniversaries of saints as even then obtaining; to the custom of signing the forehead with the Cross, as was then usual.[2] Certainly, had we been in search of information on any of these points, we should not have expected à priori to discover it in an essay which had for its heading, De Coronâ. Yet there it is.

Take another instance. Origen, in his Commentary on Genesis, has a long discussion on Gen. i. 14. "And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament," &c. Now, who would have supposed that this would have been just the place to turn to in Origen's works, to discover his opinion on the doctrine of necessity, of the freedom of man's will, his consequent responsibility for his actions, the bearing such doctrine has upon the efficacy of prayer, the nature of God's foreknowledge? Yet all these points, affecting as we must at once see they do affect a signal controversy of our own day, the Calvinistic, enter into his discussion of this text; the prevailing belief in astrology, a subject connected with these lights in the firmament, paving the way to it.[3]

How little, again, would the titles of most of the Letters of Cyprian enable us to guess at the multifarious matters to be found in them—much of them, too, bearing very directly on the controversies of modern times.

Nor is this all. Daillé, we have seen, exclaims with much self-satisfaction, after giving his own description of the contents of the writings of the Fathers, "What has all this to do with the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the worship of the Host, the supremacy of the Pope, the necessity of secret confession, the worship of images, and other matters agitated nowadays!" But it is not necessary that the Fathers should be expressly discussing these questions, in order to their giving us a great deal of light, nevertheless, on the sentiments of the Church with respect to them when they wrote. If the doctrine of Transubstantiation had never been dreamed of in the days of Justin or Irenæus, or Clemens, it is certain enough that it would be in vain to look for an argument upon it in their

[1] Tertullian, De Coronâ, c. iii.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Origen, Comment. in Gen. i. 14, vol. ii. p. 6.

works; but they may not be less effective witnesses in the dispute on that account. On the contrary, they may be the very best of all we could have. For if such phrases undesignedly fall from them, when they are speaking of the Eucharist, as are quite inconsistent with the notion that they believed in the corporal presence, that is all that is wanted to prove that the corporal presence was not a primitive doctrine. It is not necessary to require from them a regular disclaimer of such doctrine in order to avail ourselves of their testimony.

For example, there is a fragment of Irenæus, of which the following is a translation. "The Greeks seizing the slaves of the Christian catechumens, used force to extort from them the disclosure of some secret abomination of the Christians; these slaves having nothing to tell which would gratify their tormentors, except that they heard their masters say, the Holy Communion was the body and blood of Christ, thinking it was really his body and blood (*νομίσαντες τῷ ὄντι αἷμα καὶ σάρκα εἶναι*, i. e. making this mistake), reported the same to the inquirers. Accordingly these latter, supposing that this was actually the Christian mystery (*λαβόντες ὡς αὐτόχρημα τοῦτο τελεῖσθαι Χριστιανοῖς*, i. e. under this wrong impression), made the same report to the rest of the Greeks, and forced the martyrs Sanctus and Blandina by torture to a confession. To whom Blandina made answer well and bravely, How could we endure to do such an act; we who, in the practice of our Christian discipline, abstain even from permitted food?"[1] Now, I ask, is it possible that such a passage as this could have been penned, and yet the doctrine of Transubstantiation have been the doctrine of the Church at the time? for, if so, it would have been really the corporal body and blood of Christ, which Christians profess to partake of; and the slaves would have been perfectly correct in the information they gave the Greeks; and there would have been no room for Irenæus to explain the circumstance under which the misapprehension of the Greeks, prompted by that of the slaves, occurred, for there would have been no misapprehension at all by either party. Surely this is more decisive of the question of Transubstantiation, than any express repudiation of it by Irenæus would have been; for so far from repudiating it, he only wonders it could have ever entered into the head of the slaves to

[1] Irenæus, Fragment XIII. p. 343, Bened. Ed.

imagine; manifestly ascribing it to the dulness of apprehension which naturally belonged to that class of persons.

Take another instance. Cyprian, in a letter addressed to Cæcilius, is contending against the practice of certain heretics or innovators, who, in celebrating the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, made use of water only, instead of water and wine mixed (for it was the custom to mix those elements in the Eucharist at that time, as it was in our own Church, till the Prayer Book of 1549 was superseded by that of 1552, not in all respects perhaps for the better). Now, argues Cyprian, "Since Christ said, I am the true *vine*, the Blood of Christ is not water, but *wine*. Nor can his Blood, by which we are redeemed and quickened, *seem* to be in the cup, when there is no wine in the cup, by which Christ's Blood is represented, and of which there is a mystical mention made all Scripture through." Nec potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice quando vinum desit calici, quo Christi sanguis ostenditur.[1] And again in the same Epistle, "For as Christ bare us all, since he bare our sins, we perceive that the people is *understood* in the water; the Blood of Christ is *represented* by the wine." Nam quia nos omnes portabat Christus, qui et peccata nostra portabat, videmus in aquâ populum *intelligi*, in vino vero *ostendi* sanguinem Christi[2]—the word *ostendi* in the latter clause clearly in apposition to the word *intelligi* in the former, i. e. the element in either case is used *figuratively;* and to make the matter still more clear, Cyprian having quoted a well-known text in the Epistle to the Galatians, adds, "Since, therefore, neither the Apostle himself, nor an angel from heaven, could preach any other doctrine, than that which Christ and his Apostles preached once for all, I marvel more than a little, whence it could come to pass, that in some places, contrary to the Evangelical and Apostolical discipline, water should be offered in the Lord's cup, when water alone cannot possibly express the Blood of Christ"—quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere[3]—evidently implying that wine did *express* that Blood; not that it was the Blood itself. Here you see the evidence against the doctrine of Transubstantiation is furnished us, not by any explicit discussion of the subject, but incidentally, whilst the author of it is engaged with settling a

[1] Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. § 2. [2] § 13. [3] Cyprian, Epist. lxiii. § 11.

dispute of quite another character; but still that evidence is just as decisive, as if you could have put Cyprian in the witness-box, and questioned him upon the doctrine of Transubstantiation directly and at once, nay, much more decisive, for it is just as much to the purpose, and yet delivered by him without his having any idea of the use his words might be made to serve, in entire simplicity and innocence. And to revert for a moment to the consideration we have just dismissed, might not Daillé have here asked, with the same air of triumph, when he had cast his eye over the letter, and seen that it was on the subject of substituting water for wine in the Eucharist, What is all this to us? This is no concern of ours; we are no drinkers of water now—we want testimony on the question of the corporal presence!

Take another example to the same purport. Tertullian writes a treatise against Marcion, who, perplexed by the origin of evil, and the admixture of it he found in the world, devised the expedient of two Gods; the one, the God who made the world; the other, the God whom Christ revealed, and whose He was. Tertullian contends that if Marcion would examine the world, he would discover it not to be so bad as he supposed. "Imitate," says he, "if you can, the architecture of the bee, or the ant, the net of the spider, or the thread of the silkworm." Nay, further, your own God, he continues, as expressed in and by Christ, is satisfied with the Creation; "he did not reprobate the *water* belonging to the Creator, for he washes his disciples with it; nor the oil, for with that he anoints them; nor the mixture of milk and honey, with which he feeds them;" (all, you will observe, portions of the Ritual of Baptism as then practised); "nor the bread with which he represents his own very Body—quo ipsum corpus suum repræsentat"—(in the Ritual of the Eucharist); "even in his Sacraments standing in need of the beggarly elements of the Creator."[1] Or again, in another book of the same tract against Marcion, Tertullian is engaged in proving from the correspondence between the Law and the Gospel—Christ foretold and typified in the one, realised and produced in the other—that it is the same Christ which is spoken of in both; and that Marcion is wrong in supposing the God of the Law, and the God of the Gospel, not identical. Accordingly he compares the Passover of Moses with the

[1] Tertullian, Adv. Marcionem, I. c. xiv.

Passion of Christ. It was on the day of the Passover that Christ suffered; He might have chosen another day: but it had been designated before as the *Lord's* Passover; therefore, did the Lord desire with a great desire to eat it with his disciples. "Professing, therefore, this great desire to eat the Passover as *his own*—and it would have been unworthy of Him, who was God, to desire that which was *another's*—He made the bread which He took and gave to his disciples his own Body, by saying, 'This is my Body,' *i. e.* the figure of my Body, (id est figura corporis mei,) for it would not have been a figure, unless it had been a veritable body; for a vacuity or phantasm cannot take a figure."[1] And again in a third book of the same treatise, and when still engaged in the same argument, he appeals to the evidence of the senses against Marcion, and contends that Christ's reality "was attested by three of them, the sight, the touch, and the hearing."[2] But this would have been very inconclusive reasoning if Marcion could have turned upon him and said, "And yet you do not believe in the bread or the wine of the Eucharist which are attested by three of the senses." Here, again, the controversy is one in which we are not concerned. Who doubts, Daillé might say, who doubts about the Creator as represented in the Old Testament, and the Creator as represented in the New Testament, being the same God? Yet we see that this controversy does afford us clear incidental evidence against Transubstantiation.

The *worship of the host* is another point singled out by Daillé, as one to which the writings of the Fathers, such as he describes them, have no reference, they being engaged on questions of quite a different character. But, as I said in the last instance, so I say again in this, that those writings do furnish indirect testimony on this matter also. Indeed, does not the case of Transubstantiation involve this and settle it? If, as we have shown, the Fathers held no such doctrine as Transubstantiation, does it not follow as a thing of course that they fell into no such practice as the worship of the Host? Besides, is there nothing to be concluded from their *silence* with respect to any such usage? Is it not argument enough, for example, that it did not obtain in Justin's time, when we find him describing, with a good deal of minuteness, the mode of administering the Holy Eucharist, and yet saying nothing

[1] Tertullian, Adv. Marcionem, IV. c. xl. [2] III. c. ix.

whatever about the worship of the Host? Would he be likely to assure his readers, that in this Sacrament, the Communicants do not receive the bread as common bread, or the cup as a common cup (*οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν*[1]), if they had actually worshipped either the one or the other as God? Is it conceivable, that in such a case he would have adopted language so unimpassioned as this? It is true Justin has no chapter "De Hostiâ adorandâ," if nothing less than that would suffice for M. Daillé, but is not the kind of testimony presented in the few words I have extracted from him—and other similar testimony might be multiplied to almost any extent—far more valuable than any direct disclaimer of such idolatry?

The *Supremacy of the Pope* is another subject of modern controversy which M. Daillé adduces as incapable of receiving any illustration from the writings of the Fathers, being out of their field of debate. Certainly none of them have composed a treatise upon it like Dr. Barrow; but is not much to be deduced from them on the question, which is very greatly to the purpose nevertheless? Clemens Romanus, though Bishop of Rome, writes his Epistle to the Corinthians not in the name of the Pope, but in the name of the Church of Rome.[2] Irenæus speaks by implication of Jerusalem, and not of Rome, as the metropolis of the citizens of the New Testament (*ἡ μητρόπολις τῶν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης πολιτῶν*[3]), and assigns to St. Paul a very pre-eminent rank among the Apostles[4]; and if he calls the Church of Rome on one occasion "the greatest, most ancient, and universally known" (Church), and says that certainly, "considering how chief and principal a Church it is, all Churches, *i. e.* all faithful people everywhere, must be found in sentiment conformable to it, seeing that in it is preserved that Apostolical tradition which has obtained always and in all places;"[5] no conclusion for the supremacy of the Pope over

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 66.
[2] Clem. Rom. Ad Cor. I. § i.
[3] Irenæus, III. c. xii. § 5.
[4] II. c. xxi. § 2.
[5] Ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam, hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles, in quâ semper ab his, qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab apostolis traditio.—Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 2, Bened. Ed.

The translation here given from the Latin, which is all we have, may *seem* to favour the Church of Rome in a manner, which the Greek very probably, had that been preserved to us, would not have even so much as seemed to do—possibly the "convenire ad" of this Latin version answering to

Christendom can be drawn from this. For what is here his argument? He is refuting the heretics on the ground of their own choosing, tradition; and takes the Church of Rome as the fairest and safest channel of tradition then extant, as the best exponent of what tradition taught, by reason of that Church being founded by illustrious Apostles, being governed uninterruptedly by their successors, and holding so conspicuous a station in the world—the "necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam ad hanc ecclesiam" (as Mr. Evans observes),[1] implying a *consequence* not an *obligation*—where tradition was so guaranteed, it must needs be that an orthodox Christian would accept it. For so far is Irenæus from considering the doctrine of the Church of Rome as peremptory (except from the mere fact of the peculiar circumstances of that Church having given it advantages in the preservation of doctrine over other Churches less favourably placed), that he actually goes on to confirm the tradition of the Church of Rome by the tradition of the Churches of Smyrna and Ephesus, which agreed with it —a work of entire supererogation, if it was needful to submit to the Church of Rome, let it teach whatever it might. Neither is that all. If Irenæus had felt that Christendom was bound hand and foot by the Pope's supremacy, how could he have himself ventured to remonstrate with Victor, Bishop of Rome, on his excommunicating the Eastern Churches for their non-observance of his rule, and that of the Western Church, with respect to the time of keeping Easter? This resistance of Irenæus was the more gratuitous, as in the controversy in question he took the same side as Victor.

Again, the disputes in which Cyprian is engaged, constantly lead him to afford us light on this subject, inadvertently and by the way; for the immediate bone of contention, no doubt, may not be now what it then was. The question concerning the Baptism of heretics, however, on which he differed in judgment from Stephanus, Bishop of Rome, incidentally ac-

συμβάλλειν—as Mr. Evans observes (Biography of the Early Church, Victor, p. 257), *i. e.* simply "to have converse with," or "confer with;" συμβάλλειν being the word used on very similar occasions to that in the text, as he remarks, by Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 23, and v. c. 24); and a still better reference would have been to Irenæus himself, who in the very next section of this very chapter employs this word: Κλήμης, ὁ καὶ ἑωρακὼς τοὺς μακαρίους ἀποστόλους καὶ συμβεβληκὼς αὐτοῖς—Clemens, who had seen the blessed Apostles, and conferred with them.

[1] Biography of the Early Church, l. c.

quaints us with the relation in which he considered his own Church and other Churches to stand to Rome; and it is obvious that he regarded it as anything but that of passive obedience to it. He is not niggardly in his ascription of honours to St. Peter. He repeatedly considers him as the rock on which Christ founded his Church; probably in allusion to the effect of his first sermon recorded in the second chapter of the Acts. He contemplates him as peculiarly singled out by our Lord, in order that he might be a symbol of the unity which should prevail in the Church.[1] But he did not regard this as precluding the discussion of ecclesiastical questions, such as Heretical Baptism, and the decision of them accordingly. "For Peter," says he, in a letter to Quintus,[2] "whom the Lord chose first, and upon whom he built his Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him on the subject of circumcision, did not make any arrogant claims for himself, and say that he *had obtained the Primacy*, and ought to be obeyed by those that were younger and later in date than himself." And in another to Pope Stephanus himself, still on the same subject of Baptism, after expressing his own opinion which he knew was opposed to that of Stephanus, he adds, "In which matter we do not wish to put constraint upon any, or lay down any peremptory law, seeing that every ruler (præpositus) in the administration of the Church is at liberty to act according to his own free will, only having to give an account to his Lord."[3] Has this nothing to do with the question of Papal Supremacy as now debated?

Again. Turn to the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325. "Let the ancient customs prevail," it says, (*τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω*,) "those in Egypt, and Libya, and Pentapolis, to wit, that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over them all, since in the case of the Bishop of Rome the like is customary; and in a similar manner with respect to Antioch, and in the other provinces, let the ancient customs be preserved to the Churches."[4] And now turn to the eighth canon of the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, and see how this prior canon was acted on in a particular case. "Rheginus, our brother Bishop, well-beloved in God, and the well-beloved Bishops of the province of Cyprus, Zeno and Evagrius with him, have

[1] Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesiæ, § 4.
[2] Ep. lxxi.
[3] Ep. lxxii.
[4] Routh, Scriptorum Ecclesiastic. Opusc. tom. i. p. 374. Oxon. 1840.

brought under our notice an innovation contrary to the ecclesiastical laws and canons of the holy Fathers, and touching the liberty of all . . . that the Bishop of the City of Antioch holds Ordinations in Cyprus, as certain very reverend men, who have come to this holy Synod, have informed us by certificates, (λιβέλλων,) and word of mouth. Therefore, since public disorders have need of greater remedies, inasmuch as they bring with them greater damage, and especially where ancient usage does not obtain, those who preside over the holy Churches of Cyprus shall, without impediment or hurt, according to the canons of the holy Fathers and ancient usage, hold Ordinations of their most revered Bishops, among *themselves*. And the same rule shall be kept in all other dioceses and provinces whatever, so that no one of these Bishops well-beloved of God shall occupy another province which has not been subject to him from the beginning, or to those before him; and if any one hath seized and subjected any such to himself by force, let him restore the same, that the canons of the Fathers may not be transgressed; and that under the pretext of the sacerdotal office, (ἱερουργίας,) the pride of worldly power may not creep in, nor we, by little and little, and without being aware of it, lose the liberty which our Lord Jesus Christ, the liberator of all men, gave us at the cost of his own Blood."[1] Now, I ask, does this case of the Church of Cyprus afford no conclusions for ourselves; and because the supremacy of the Pope of Rome is not, in so many words, made the subject of an ancient treatise, or ecclesiastical canon, are we at liberty to throw away such documents, as having nothing to do with it? I press these considerations the more, because I have too much respect for the reading of Daillé to believe that he was writing in ignorance; but most strongly suspect that he was deliberately misleading people, who were not likely, he thought, to look into authorities for themselves; and accordingly his book has been in the vogue it has with that uncommonly large class; and, I believe, has been recently republished,[2] as if the times called for it; but what times can call for artifice, or what cause prosper by disingenuous defence?

The *necessity of secret confession* is another question which Daillé singles out, as one which does not admit of illustration

[1] Routh. Scriptorum Ecclesiastic. Opusc. tom. ii. p. 10.

[2] Re-edited and amended, with a preface by the Rev. G. Jekyll, LL.B. 1843.

from anything the Fathers say, so alien from it are the topics they handle. And, as I have observed in similar cases, there certainly is no treatise expressly on the subject by any early Father; but there is that in them which bears upon it: though a member of the Church of England, at least, however it might be with a foreign Protestant, is not called upon to be particularly careful in this matter, seeing that in her Communion Service, though not insisting upon the necessity of confession, she exhorts persons, under certain circumstances, to come to the Minister and *open their grief*, that they "may receive the benefit of *absolution*, together with ghostly counsel and advice." And in her Service for the Visitation of the Sick, she instructs the Minister to examine the sick man, whether he repents him of his sins; and at a particular part of the office, to move him "to make a special confession of his sins, if he feel his conscience troubled;" and after that (and not before), to absolve him. She does not go further than this, because she does not see *secret* confession to a Priest absolutely enjoined as a matter of necessity, either in Scripture, or the Primitive Church the interpreter of Scripture; for though frequent mention is made in the early Fathers of confession, I doubt whether any passage can be produced from them which does not admit of being explained of *public confession* in the Church, and, in general, which does not bear this meaning evidently on the face of it, except in case of sickness. But, if so, how can Daillé adduce the subject of *secret* confession, as another topic on which the Fathers can be made of no avail, and another instance of the little concern they can be persuaded to have in modern polemics? Irenæus touches upon the question of confession more than once, and has been claimed indeed by the Romanist as a witness in his favour—Irenæus, who is never dreaming, be it observed, of the point we are investigating; and whose treatise, as Daillé says, is ostensibly upon heresies which have long passed away and been forgotten—he then, who is engaged in scourging the lives and conversation of these heretics, most perfect (τελειότατοι), as they called themselves, charges them, amongst other things, with "corrupting other men's wives, as the women themselves," he continues, "who have been seduced by them *have often confessed together with their other sins*, when they have afterwards been converted

to the Church of God"[1]—and adds that some of them made a public confession, but others, shrinking from this, through shame, quietly withdrew themselves from the life of God in despair; others became apostates altogether; and others again halted between the two conditions[2]—evidently intimating that such public confession was necessary in order to restoration to the Church, when they had been baptized and relapsed into notorious offences.

We should draw the same conclusion from the manner in which Tertullian speaks of this ἐξομολόγησις: "This exomologesis or confession," says he, "is an act of great humiliation and prostration of the man; it regulates the dress, the food; it enjoins sackcloth and ashes; it defiles the body with filth, and subdues the spirit with anguish; it restricts meat and drink to the simplest possible; it nourishes prayer by fasting; it inculcates groans and tears, and invocations of the Lord God day and night; and teaches the penitent to cast himself at the feet of his Presbyters, and clasp the knees of these servants of God, and to beg of all *the brethren* to intercede with God for mercy. Such is the homologesis"[3]—the whole evidently a public act. He speaks afterwards of "many shrinking from the work, more regardful of their shame than of their salvation;"[4] and asks, "whether it is better to conceal your sin and be damned, than to expose it and receive absolution."[5]

Again, Cyprian speaks of confession in numberless places, but it still seems to be *public* confession. Thus, in several of his Letters, he complains of persons who had lapsed in persecution and renounced Christ, having been received to the Communion furtively by certain Presbyters of his Church. This he resents as a breach of all discipline. Even in the case of "minor offences, sinners," says he, in a letter to his Clergy on this scandal,[6] "express their penitence at a suitable season, and come to *Confession*, according to the rules of discipline, and are admitted into communion by imposition of the hands of the Bishops and Clergy." And in another letter,[7] addressed to the "people," on the same affair, as though they were par-

[1] Irenæus, I. c. xiii. §§ 5, 7.
[2] § 7.
[3] Tertullian, De Pœnitentiâ, c. ix.
[4] c. x.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Cyprian, Ep. ix.
[7] Ep. xi.

ties concerned in it, he begs that nothing final may be settled till he should himself be restored to them, when it might be proceeded with, "yourselves being present and judging;" still, except in cases of dangerous sickness, where the patient is confessed and absolved at once, because there will probably be no room afterwards either for confession or absolution, and where Cyprian gives directions accordingly,[1] *public* humiliation seeming to be contemplated. But this discipline, however severe, would be a very different thing from *secret* confession; and not liable to the dreadful abuses which, no doubt, the secret confessional (whether legitimate or not in itself, and when rightly restricted) was likely to lead to, and did lead to actually and in fact. But however this may be, and to whatever conclusion the Fathers may lead us in this controversy, my end is answered; which is to show that Daillé is not justified in representing the writings of the Fathers as altogether inapplicable to such a question; for however casually it may present itself in their writings, and whatever may be the aspect of it they offer, the question of secret confession is clearly one upon which they may be made to speak in one shape or other; and I could have doubled or trebled the length of this Lecture, had I chosen to bring forward all the materials they would furnish upon it. Daillé's argument, which I am combating, you will remark, is this, that the Fathers are of little worth to us in our own controversies, because they treat of matters that have no relation to them.

The *worship of images* is the last of the instances he happens to bring forward in the place I am dealing with,[2] to prove the irrelevance of patristical literature; but he does it with no better success than before. Certainly it was reserved for a much later age than that we are now treating of to produce dissertations for and against the use of images in Churches: nor is there any tract of an early Father, which, from its title, would bespeak it to have any especial reference to the question here contemplated. But again I say, are we on that account to put them away, and console ourselves with the reflection that, were we to trouble ourselves ever so much about them, we should only have our labour for our pains? I think not. If image-worship did not exist in the Primitive Church, it is not to be expected that we should find anything expressly

[1] Epp. xii. and xxxi. [2] Daillé, p. 9.

said about it in the writers of that Church—but still we can use their testimony. For instance, we learn from the Apologies that one of the accusations most commonly brought against the Christians by the heathens, was that they were atheists. Justin replies to it at length in his first "Apology,"[1] and Athenagoras in his "Πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν"[2]—the latter using language which I shall translate, because evidently pointing to the conclusion which I am about to come to. "I have made it appear," says he, "clearly enough, that we are no atheists, accounting, as we do, God to be one, uncreated, everlasting, invisible, impassive, incomprehensible, incapable of being contained within space, comprehended by the mind and reason alone, encompassed with light, and beauty, and spirit, and unutterable power, by whom the universe was created, and set in order, and is preserved through his Word." The very diction of the defence suggests the real ground of the accusation, viz. that atheism was imputed to the Christians because no images of their gods were to be found in their Churches; and therefore the heathens supposed that they had no God: a supposition which the Apologists endeavour to remove by showing that their God was invisible, and of a nature not to be represented by a material image. Indeed, it is their boast (Origen records it) that the meanest and least instructed of the Christians could not be brought to believe that the Deity could be expressed by symbols wrought by the hands of base mechanics; herein proving themselves, as they said, superior even to the philosophers of the heathen.[3] And this conclusion is further confirmed by another consideration. It was actually imputed to the Christians that they worshipped the Cross,[4] to which Tertullian replies by an argumentum ad hominem, not unusual with him; and Minucius Felix, who also adverts to it,[5] retorts it after the manner of Tertullian, though he denies it too.[6] But whence the charge? except from the Cross being the only symbol which the heathens could detect, either in the Churches or out of them, for which the Christians seemed to have a reverence. Could they possibly have entertained this belief, if they had seen images in the Christian Churches? There is a passage in Irenæus which

[1] Apol. I. §§ 6, 13.
[2] Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, § 10.
[3] See Origen, Contra Celsum, VI. § 14, et alibi.
[4] Tertullian, Apol. c. xvi.
[5] Minucius Felix, Octav. c. xii.
[6] c. xxix.

furnishes us with evidence on the same side of this question, and of the same indirect kind. When speaking of a certain sect of the followers of Carpocrates, he says, "they call themselves Gnostics, and adopt pictures and images of Christ, alleging that the original was made by Pilate, at the time when Jesus was among men. These they crown with chaplets, and expose them among the figures of the philosophers of this world, such as Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle, and the rest; treating them with the same kind of reverence as the heathens express for their images."[1] It is impossible to believe that Irenæus would have penned a paragraph like this, if the Church of his day had been in the habit of presenting pictures and images of the Saviour to the devotions of the people.

Another opportunity will occur hereafter of enlarging upon this subject, though under another head of the argument,[2] and of showing, in yet more ample detail, how far Daillé is from being correct, when he represents the writings of the Fathers as inapplicable to present controversies; and, above all, when he exemplifies by the questions in dispute between the Reformed Church and the Church of Rome—another opportunity, I say, will shortly arrive for pursuing this investigation further, when I come to consider the allegation which he makes against the Church of Rome of corrupting the text of the Fathers to serve purposes of her own. For the present, let the instances I have adduced suffice to prove that the works of the Fathers may certainly be turned to account in the debate between these Churches, and that much information to the purpose is to be derived from them. Yet how incidentally do we get at it! How little would heads of chapters or tables of contents, help us to it! And who shall say that the Fathers are not to be read, because they are concerned with matters which have no relation to our disputes? Rather, I should say, they are not only to be read, but to be read most carefully, and with a spirit thoroughly on the alert for allusions in them which are thus latent, but which, nevertheless, are assuredly there—no less careful investigation of them than this sufficing for mastering the most valuable of the matter of which they are made up.

[1] Et reliquam observationem circa eas, similiter ut Gentes, faciunt.— Irenæus, I. c. xxv. § 6.

[2] In Lectures IV. and V.

LECTURE III.

Third argument of Daillé—its insufficiency to establish his proposition. The quotation of the Sibyl by the Fathers explained. Vindication of them from the charge of dishonesty in quoting Apocryphal books. Opinions of Vossius, Hammond, and others, on the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Pastor of Hermas. Arguments of Daillé against the Epistles of Ignatius inconclusive. Comparison of passages in Irenæus, Polycarp, Tertullian, with passages in those Epistles. Quotation of them by Origen. Improbability that Eusebius should have been deceived as to their genuineness.

THUS far we have found Daillé decrying the use of the Fathers, first by reason of the writings they have left being few, and often fragmentary; secondly, by reason of the subjects of those writings being altogether alien from the controversies of modern times.

The third ground on which he depreciates them is the suspicion of forgery and interpolation which affects many of their works.

Accordingly he produces a long catalogue of spurious compositions, bestowing a good deal of ostentatious pains on each, as it passes in review, and then concludes, that it is evident very many persons, and, especially, the Latin monks and clergy, from the eighth century to his own, considered it lawful to invent, change, and interpolate, whenever such proceeding might seem to conduce to the advantage of their religion. And as whatever we possess of ancient books is derived to us from this quarter, he does not think it so wonderful, that numbers of these are now in circulation under the title of ancient, which are partly false and supposititious, partly vitiated and corrupted, as that there should be any, however few, which should have reached us pure and genuine.[1] But though this array of mendacious documents is very well calculated to produce an impression of distrust in antiquity on persons, who have not turned their attention to patristic theology, yet

[1] Daillé, p. 46.

others would know that of these writings, which he produces in general the spuriousness is now and has long been universally admitted; and that when we urge the advantage of reading the Fathers, we are never contemplating these, but far other works. Surely it does not follow that because there is much that is false, there is nothing that is true: on the contrary, it is the existence of the genuine that gives occasion to the counterfeit. Irenæus expressly tells us, that the heretics "had concocted and put in circulation an unspeakable number of apocryphal and spurious Scriptures, to the confusion of illiterate persons and of such as were not acquainted with the writings of truth."[1] And if you will look at Jones on the Canon of Scripture, you will see[2] that the mere titles of apocryphal books, which issued in the very earliest age of the Church, and laid claim more or less to Apostolical authority, occupy five octavo pages. Are we then on that account to reject or suspect the canonical books of the New Testament? They are very few in comparison with the others; and it would be a very easy thing for a sceptic, arguing in the spirit of Daillé, to mislead people, too ignorant or too indolent to inquire for themselves, into a notion that in the midst of such a mass of moving quicksands, it was next to impossible to find any solid, trustworthy footing. Certainly it is credible that in the time of Daillé arguments might occasionally be drawn from one or other of the works on his condemned list; perhaps it may be alleged of some of our great divines of even the Augustan age of our Church, that they were not always sufficiently scrupulous in their appeals to ancient authority: indeed, the credit of some of the tracts they rely on, had not then, perhaps, been accurately tested; now, however, and for a long time past, controversialists would not have recourse to any such weapons; severer criticism and a more jealous public taste having superseded the more confiding temperament of former ages: so that Daillé's inflated difficulties[3] on this subject need not disturb us.

However, Daillé at length escapes from this cloud of false witnesses, with which he has taken a good deal of trouble to compass his readers about, and proceeds[4] to charge several of those Fathers, who certainly are genuine, with ministering to the system of fraud, which he is exposing, by themselves

[1] Irenæus, I. c. xx. § 1.
[2] Jones on the Canon, Part I. c. iii.
[3] Daillé, p. 48.
[4] p. 53.

quoting as authority works which were of none. Thus Justin, Theophilus, and others, do not scruple to fetch arguments from the verses of the Sibyl; as if they were really oracular.[1] It is not quite clear, whether Daillé means to impute a fraudulent intention to these authors in this transaction or not. For he says, that the Fathers were not always gifted with powers to discover these impostures; but he insinuates the worse alternative. Now, undoubtedly, several of the early Fathers do quote the Sibyl; Justin and Theophilus amongst the rest; but in the first place it must be remembered, that on these occasions they were addressing heathens, often literary heathens, and that there was very little ground which they could occupy in common. It was in vain to plead with them Scripture testimony; for the authority of the Scripture they were not prepared to admit. Accordingly, whenever they can do it, they sustain their arguments on other evidence, which the heathens were accustomed to respect. Thus for some of the incidents of our Saviour's life, they would appeal to the Acts of Cyrenius or to those of Pilate[2]; for the mystical power of the Cross, to the writings of Plato, who found it in the letter X, with which he represented the world as impressed from one end to the other[3]; and on numberless other occasions they make the sentiments of that philosopher tributary to establishing the facts and doctrines of the revelation they taught. And so in like manner they availed themselves of the writings of the Sibyl, which circulated very largely throughout the heathen world and were held in much reverence as prophetic by the class for whom they were writing, to give force to many arguments which might otherwise have seemed strange to them, and would have hardly obtained credence—such as the creation of man—the final conflagration —the future Advent of the Messiah—and many of the circumstances which should attend it.[4] There was nothing necessarily disingenuous in this. Doubtless in process of time verses of the Sibyl became multiplied without end, and bore on their very face the mark of the comparatively modern date at which they were composed, and yet were adopted by Christian writers. But from the beginning it was not so. Bishop

[1] Daillé, p. 53.
[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. §§ 34, 35.
[3] § 60.
[4] Justin Martyr, Cohort. ad Græcos, §§ 37, 38; Apol. I. § 20.

Bull considers, and with the strongest grounds for doing so, that the Jewish prophecies pervaded a great part of the heathen world, more or less obscured, (for the Jews were dispersed over nearly the whole of it,) and that out of these prophecies many of the verses of the Sibyl (as they were called) were fabricated from times the most ancient. The Septuagint translation of the Scriptures, circulating, as it did, amongst the Jews of all nations, must have communicated its contents to many Gentiles[1]; and it may be added, that an early version of the Old Testament into Greek long before the Septuagint translation, of which Clemens Alexandrinus tells us on the authority of Aristobulus, would materially conduce to this.[2] Prophetical the verses were, strictly prophetical, and not unworthy in such cases of being quoted by the primitive Fathers, as they were witnesses on their side; the Fathers themselves ascribing, no doubt, the truth they felt to be in them, either to the sacred channels, from which they supposed them to be derived—Justin, when giving the history of the Sibyl,[3] expressly makes her to be born at Babylon, and thence come to Italy: where more likely that she should became acquainted with the writings of the Prophets?—or to the fact of her own inspiration, which was the vulgar belief; or at least it was the belief that there was one *inspired* Sibyl, the existence of whom occasioned a number of counterfeits,[4] she, raised up by God as a prophetess amongst the Greeks, as the prophets, properly so called, were by Him to the Hebrews. Is there anything in this derogatory to the character of Justin for honesty, or even for judgment? What was Balaam but such a Prophet amongst the nations of the East, and Job amongst the Arabians, and Melchizedek amongst the inhabitants of Canaan? We read of prophetic

[1] See Grinfield, Apology for the Septuagint.

[2] Ἀριστόβουλος δὲ ἐν τῷ πρώτῳ τῷ πρὸς τὸν Φιλομήτορα, κατὰ λέξιν γράφει· "Κατηκολούθηκε δὲ ὁ Πλάτων τῇ καθ' ἡμᾶς νομοθεσίᾳ καὶ φανερός ἐστι περιεργασάμενος ἕκαστα τῶν ἐν αὐτῇ λεγομένων. διειρμήνευται δὲ πρὸ Δημητρίου, ὑφ' ἑτέρου, πρὸ τοῦ Ἀλεξάνδρου καὶ Περσῶν ἐπικρατήσεως, τά τε κατὰ τὴν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου ἐξαγωγὴν τῶν Ἑβραίων τῶν ἡμετέρων πολιτῶν, καὶ ἡ τῶν γεγονότων ἁπάντων αὐτοῖς ἐπιφάνεια, καὶ κράτησις τῆς χώρας, καὶ τῆς ὅλης νομοθεσίας ἐπεξήγησις· ὥστε εὔδηλον εἶναι, τὸν προειρημένον φιλόσοφον εἰληφέναι πολλά· γέγονε γὰρ πολυμαθής· καθὼς καὶ Πυθαγόρας πολλὰ τῶν παρ' ἡμῖν μετενέγκας εἰς τὴν ἑαυτοῦ δογματοποιΐαν."—Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § xxii. pp. 410, 411.

[3] Cohort. ad Græcos, § 37. He represents her as the daughter of Berosus.

[4] Tertullian, Ad Nationes, II. § 12, and Fragment attached to the Apology, Ed. Havercamp, p. 443.

dreams even amongst the Midianites.[1] Certainly by some means or other, you must account for a great deal of very curious knowledge with respect to the Messiah to come, which pervaded the whole heathen world—knowledge, too, which the Gentiles themselves (though not understanding it of the Messiah, but puzzled how to understand it at all), did consider to relate to the events of futurity, and themselves assigned it to the Sibyl as its author. I scarcely need remind you of the Pollio of Virgil, where the incidents are expressly said to be drawn from the vaticinations of the Sibyl, some of them according most remarkably with those of Isaiah, and the whole almost as applicable to Christ as any chapter of that Prophet. The Prometheus, too, of Æschylus, though the facts are not in that case avowedly referred to the same source, does savour of the same original; and however dark the fable might seem to those who handled it, nobody can dispute that it is founded on more than human knowledge. The well-known passage in Suetonius' Life of Vespasian tends to the same point, that "there had been for a long time, all over the East, a prevailing opinion, that it was in the *Fates*," (in the decrees or books of the Fates, says Lardner,) "some one from Judæa should *then* obtain the empire of the world."[2] Where was the harm of the early Fathers taking advantage of a medium like this for arresting the attention of the heathen to the tidings they had to impart to them? more especially as it should appear from a few words let fall by Origen, that it was really debated (whether amongst the Christians one with another, or amongst the heathens and Christians), what authority was due to the Sibyl, and whether she was to be accounted a prophetess or not, so that there would seem to be nothing clandestine or underhand in the use the Christians made of the argument[3]; and, moreover, the passage would lead us to infer that this question had been agitated even as early as the times of Celsus, who lived some hundred years before Origen.[4]

As another instance of the unscrupulous use made of authorities by the Fathers, Daillé adduces the appeals, which Clemens Alexandrinus makes to Apocryphal books that circulated under the names of Apostles and disciples of the Lord,

[1] Judges vii. 13, 14.
[2] Suetonius, Life of Vespasian, § 4.
[3] Origen, Contra Celsum, V. § 61.
[4] I. § 8.

and his quotations from the pretended works of Barnabas and Hermas.[1] He also takes the like exceptions to Fathers of a later age than I am concerned with, and which, therefore, I shall not investigate; my object being to impress you with the importance of reading, not all the Fathers of every age, so much as the Fathers of the first three centuries. But does the manner in which Clemens avails himself of Apocryphal writings affect his own credit as an author or a candid Apologist? Certainly he refers to the "Gospel according to the Hebrews;" to the "Gospel according to the Egyptians;" to the "Traditions of Matthias;" to the "Preaching of Peter;" to a "certain Gospel;"[2] and perhaps to the "Acts of Peter."[3] And often he so refers without any remark whatever as to the value of the document he is laying under contribution. But you will bear this in mind, a fact which Daillé altogether overlooks, but a very important one; that on one of these occasions he expressly speaks of no Gospels being of authority except the *four*. "On Salome inquiring," this is the passage, "when the things which she asked about would be known; the Lord replied, when ye shall tread under foot" (or have no need for) "the covering of your shame; and when two shall become one, and the male with the female shall be neither male nor female;" and then Clemens adds, by way of shaking the effect of this paragraph, which was advocating a cause to which he was opposed,[4] "First, then, I contend, that we have not this saying *in the four Gospels delivered to us*, but in the Gospel according to the Egyptians."[5] I say this observation must be carried along with us, when we meet with other quotations from Apocryphal Gospels and like works in Clemens; for however he may not at the moment declare in so many words the comparative estimation in which he holds them, we have it under his own hands, that none of them rank with him at all as the four Canonical Gospels do. For example, he adduces this same Gospel according to the Egyptians in another place, as follows: "But they who oppose

[1] Daillé, p. 53.

[2] Ὁ Κύριος ἔν τινι Εὐαγγελίῳ.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. V. § x. p. 684.

[3] VII. § xi. p. 869. See Grabe, Spicilegium, vol. i. p. 79.

[4] The passage was advanced by a heretic, one Cassianus, as adverse to marriage; Cassianus being himself opposed to marriage, whilst Clemens contends for the lawfulness of it.

[5] Ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν τῷ κατ' Αἰγυπτίους.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. III. § xiii. p. 553.

themselves to the Creation of God by their specious continence, allege those things which were addressed to Salome, whereof I have made mention already. They occur, I think," continues Clemens, "in the Gospel according to the Egyptians."[1] Now here you see the Gospel according to the Egyptians is cited without any notice of distrust in it or any mark of depreciation. Yet from the other passage, already laid before you, it appears, that though he is here silent about its merits, Clemens had no wish to disguise his real opinion of it. I may as well observe by the way, that though Clemens does not specify what were the *four* Gospels to which he assigns such superior weight, there can be no doubt that our *four* they were; for he was contemporary with Irenæus, though probably born a few years later than that author; and the testimony of Irenæus to the Canonical Gospels of his day being the four we now have, and no other, is undeniable[2]; not to say that Clemens himself quotes St. Matthew in one place as τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον Εὐαγγέλιον,[3] and St. Luke in another, as τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον τὸ κατὰ Λουκᾶν.[4] The same reasoning as before applies to the quotations made by Clemens from the Gospel according to the Hebrews. He is contending, for instance, that to admire is the first step to knowledge, and therefore, "in the Gospel according to the Hebrews," says he, "it is written, he that admireth shall rule, and he that ruleth shall rest,"[5] without any remark added on the nature of the document; but if there were then only four acknowledged Gospels (as he felt was the case), there was no need for remark. The same may be said of his citation of the τι Εὐαγγέλιον. "It belongs to few to take these things in, for the Lord says in a *certain Gospel*, that he does not teach in a niggardly spirit, 'My mysteries are for me and the children of my house:'"[6] no note or comment subjoined, because none was wanted. Even in the case of the Gospel according to the Egyptians, where the observation respecting the Four Gospels, on which I am relying so much, is made, it is made, you will perceive, quite incidentally, and almost as though it escaped him by the by.

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. III. § ix. pp. 539, 540.
[2] Irenæus, III. c. xi. § 8.
[3] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § xxi. p. 409.
[4] p. 407.
[5] II. § ix. p. 453.
[6] V. § x. p. 684.

And if it be said, why then multiply quotations? It may be answered in the first place, that Clemens was a man of enormous reading, and could not help showing it; his reference to profane as well as to sacred, or quasi-sacred authorities, being most profuse; indeed, he had a reason for the former display, which I shall make appear in a future Lecture. There is nothing singular or offensive in this. Look at Bishop Jeremy Taylor's Life of Christ, and you will see him supporting or adorning his narrative by appeals to numberless authors, whose credit he leaves his readers to settle as they will, contenting himself with saying who they are, or with referring to them in the margin. Yet how many of these authors are of little or no account! And in the next place, no doubt many of the documents, which were written at this very early period of the Church, in the midst of much error, contained much truth. It is the testimony of an Apostle himself, that "there are also many other things" (besides those carefully recorded), "which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one," he supposes, "that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written."[1] There is a saying assigned to Jesus in the Acts,[2] which there is no previous memorandum of his having ever uttered. There are several other sayings preserved by the early Fathers[3]; together with one or two incidents respecting him, not taken notice of by the Evangelists.[4] There might be, nay, it is highly probable that there was, much of this kind to be discovered in the many unauthorized publications which found their way into the world in the age immediately after our Lord's Passion; and which, however overlaid by base materials, did give to those publications a certain value nevertheless. Indeed, St. Luke's Preface to his Gospel implies, I think, that the histories of our blessed Lord, which his own was meant to supersede, were of this mixed character, not absolute fiction, but truth adulterated. "Forasmuch as *many* have taken in

[1] John xxi. 25. [2] Acts xx. 35.

[3] Ἐν οἷς ἂν ὑμᾶς καταλάβω, ἐν τούτοις καὶ κρινῶ.—Justin. Dialog. § 47.

Venient dies, in quibus vineæ nascentur, singulæ decem millia palmitum habentes, et in uno palmite dena millia brachiorum, &c.—Irenæus, V. c. xxxiii. § 3. A collection of these sayings and histories of Christ will be found gathered from their several sources in the Appendix of the first volume of Jones on the Canon.

[4] Ἐν σπηλαίῳ τινὶ σύνεγγυς τῆς κώμης κατέλυσε.—He put up in a certain cave near the village.—Justin. Dialog. § 78. Ταῦτα γὰρ τὰ τέκτονικὰ ἔργα εἰργάζετο ἐν ἀνθρώποις ὤν, ἄροτρα καὶ ζυγά.—Justin. Dialog. § 88.

hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed,"[1] the spirit of the passage not being utterly to condemn the writings he is contemplating of gross and wilful falsehood, but to imply that the authors' understanding of the incidents they had related was not perfect; that their opportunities of learning them had not been like his own, he having had perfect knowledge of them from the first, and that the knowledge therefore which he would communicate would be certainty, which could not be said of that of the others. Even when these early documents proceeded from *heretical* quarters, as probably many of them did, the substance of them would still, in many cases, be truth; they would scarcely have answered the purpose of their compilers had it been otherwise. The "Traditions of Matthias," the "Preaching of Peter," "the Acts of Peter," and something "of Paul's," probably combined with the "Preaching of Peter,"[2] all, as I have said, quoted by Clemens, were, no doubt, publications of the nature I am describing; truth mingled, or, as it might be, grossly debased with error. Origen himself takes this view of the last of these documents, observing, in a passage of his commentary on St. John, where he has occasion to quote a saying of Heracleon, who had adopted certain words from the "Preaching of Peter," we must inquire touching this work "whether it is genuine, or spurious, or mixed,"[3] himself apparently leaning to the last supposition. With respect to the first of these, the "Traditions of Matthias," Clemens refers to it several times, but not in a way to impress us with his confidence in it; rather the contrary; for though in one or two places he simply quotes without preface, in others he intimates in a manner that ought to satisfy M. Daillé himself, that its character, even in his eyes, was suspicious. Thus of the heresies, says Clemens, "some are called by the name of their

[1] Luke i. 1–4.
[2] See Jones on the Canon, Part II.
[3] Πότερόν ποτε γνήσιόν ἐστιν ἢ μικτόν.—Origen, vol. iv. p. 226. Bened. Ed.

author, as that of Valentinus, and Marcion, and Basilides, although, indeed, they boast that the *opinions of Matthias* may be adduced in support of their own. But as there was but one doctrine delivered by all the Apostles, so can there be but one (true) tradition."[1] Surely there is here a caveat interposed by Clemens sufficiently intelligible to prevent any of his readers from being misled by the authority of the "Traditions of Matthias," though he has occasion to refer to that work. With respect to the "Preaching of Peter," another of the ecclesiastical writings frequently cited by Clemens, it is to be observed, that Clemens never cites it as Scripture, and that in the long extracts he makes from it there is nothing heterodox to be found; nothing which might not be consistent with the theory, which is Dr. Grabe's,[2] that it was what some or other of St. Peter's hearers had committed to writing after he was dead. Take the following as a specimen of the work, and say whether it falls short of the character I am imputing to it. The passage occurs in the sixth book of the Stromata. "And the companions of Christ, who preached the word as he did, lost their lives after him. Hence Peter in his *Preaching*, speaking of the Apostles, says, 'But when we had read the books, which we possess, of the Prophets, and which now in parables, now in enigmas, now again authoritatively and literally speak of Jesus Christ by name; we found his presence, and death, and cross, and all his other sufferings, which the Jews inflicted on him (described), and his resurrection, and ascension into heaven, before (the new) Jerusalem should be built,[3] even as it is written: 'these things are all which he ought to have suffered, and what should be after him.' We therefore, becoming acquainted with these things, believed in God, by reason of the things which were written concerning him.' And presently, afterwards," Clemens adds, "Peter again infers that the prophecies were (written) by Divine foreknowledge, thus saying, 'For we know that God really appointed these things, and without the Scripture we say nothing.'"[4]

[1] Μία γὰρ ἡ πάντων γέγονε τῶν Ἀποστόλων ὥσπερ διδασκαλία, οὕτως δὲ καὶ ἡ παράδοσις.— Clem. Alex. Stromat. VII. § xvii. p. 900.

[2] Grabe, Spicileg. i. pp. 61, 62.

[3] Πρὸ τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμα κτισθῆναι, unless we read ληφθῆναι, ἁλωθῆναι, καθαιρεθῆναι, vel tale aliquid, making the words then refer to the earthly Jerusalem.

[4] Καὶ οὐδὲν ἄτερ γραφῆς λέγομεν.— Clem. Alex. Stromat. VI. § xv. pp. 804, 805.

Is it then to be charged upon Clemens as an act of fraud and fallacy, or even of folly and weakness, that he made use of a work which expresses itself after this manner, when his subject happened to remind him of a passage in it that suited him, without cautioning his readers against its pretensions; what it really was being most likely notorious all the while? Would it expose a man now to the charge of wilful deception, if in a treatise he should quote the Apocrypha without expressly stating that the Apocrypha was not canonical?

The same reasoning will apply to his use of the "Acts of Peter;" if indeed it is to that document that a passage in the Stromata refers,[1] as Grabe supposes,[2] though the title is not given by Clemens. At all events it is only quoted by him with a φασί—"*they say* that the blessed Peter, when he beheld his wife led to death, was pleased that she was sent for and conducted homewards, and addressed her with a cheering word of comfort and exhortation, calling her by name and saying, 'Remember the Lord.'"

With respect to Clemens' citations of the writings of Hermas and of Barnabas, fictitious as they are according to Daillé, which is another article of impeachment that Daillé prefers against him on this occasion, we may observe, that supposing Clemens to have believed in the title of these writings to be considered the works of the authors whose names they bear, which seems to have been the case, still there is nothing in this to damage his character in any way. He erred, if he did err, in common with many others of the early Church; indeed it was nothing but a general feeling of that kind prevalent in the Church that preserved them. In those times it must have been beyond measure difficult to decide the canon of Scripture peremptorily. All was to be done by the inspection of manuscripts, which circulated in the several distant churches throughout the world, and a comparison of the local evidence possessed by these churches for fixing each manuscript upon the writer. There were then no Councils of the Church. Conference was no easy matter where the parties were very remote from one another and often watched with jealousy by the powers of the day, and had to conduct so many of their operations clandestinely, and under the constant experience or

[1] Stromat. VII. § xi. p. 869.

[2] Grabe, Spicileg. i. p. 79.

apprehension of persecution. There was no volume of the New Testament bound up as now, in ordinary use, and dispersed by millions; but some manuscript books in the keeping of some Churches, and some in the keeping of others, as it might be. And the absolute necessity for such a volume was not at first so imperative, as it became shortly afterwards: for the appeal was not in those days so directly and invariably to Scripture as it now is. There was for a time a substitute for it to some extent in the fresh tradition, which as yet ran pure and unpolluted in every Apostolical Church—a tradition which the sound Churchmen were perpetually appealing to (as we actually find to have been the case), and were compelled to appeal to in support of the truth against the heretics, who often denied the authority of the Scriptures which were objected to them, and were only to be refuted by the living voice of the Church, which had taught otherwise than they would have it, from the time of Christ and the Apostles to the time in question; against the heretics too, who often again adulterated Scripture, and could only have their iniquities exposed and refuted by producing the usage and language of the Church, ever since a Church there was. I say that under all these circumstances, a man must have had great perplexity in satisfying himself what was canonical Scripture, and what was not, particularly when (as I have already observed) the latter was often only the truth alloyed, not the truth denied—alloyed in a more or less perceptible degree. And his perplexity would perhaps be greater, as to excluding certain books, than as to admitting certain others, for the evidence in favour of the latter might have been at once overwhelming, whilst the evidence against the former might be supposed then to have come but partially to light, and it might have been imagined, that further intercourse among the churches would supply testimony which seemed at first lacking. Who shall wonder therefore that, for a time, a few documents should have been amongst the doubtful—that the judgment of the Church should have been suspended with respect to them, waiting for further facts to transpire. It was so with respect to some Scriptures afterwards admitted into the Canon. It was so with respect to some (these works of Hermas and Barnabas among the number), afterwards excluded from it. Clemens was amongst those who, when he wrote, thought them

authoritative, or at least written by the disciples to whom they were ascribed. Modern scholars as great as Daillé have done the same. Isaac Vossius and Hammond both defend the epistle of Barnabas. Usher and Bull both respect it; the latter of whom also repels the exceptions taken against the Shepherd of Hermas.[1] And perhaps a still greater name than any of them, Bishop Pearson, does the same.[2] And possibly one reason why Daillé and those of his school attack the authority of these two works with such acrimony is (as Bishop Bull suggests of Blondel's dealing with Hermas), the testimony one of them at least supplies against him on the subject of Episcopacy[3]; as the other also does on the subject of the freedom of the will[4]; and that which both of them bear to the life-giving or regenerating power of Baptism.[5] We may suspect this the rather, because though the same Clemens quotes on two occasions the epistle to the Corinthians of his name-sake of Rome, and ascribes it in terms just as express to the Apostolic Clemens,[6] and though at least as much might have been made by a perverse interpretation of the reference to the phœnix contained in that epistle,[7] as is made by him of the reference to the Sibyl found in Clemens Alexandrinus; yet inasmuch as the epistle of Clemens Romanus is not calculated to alarm so much any of Daillé's prejudices or those of his persuasion, he suffers this peccadillo of his author to escape scot-free, and accounts it, apparently, no matter of charge, that Clemens should give his sanction to this primitive document.

We may the more freely draw this inference, from the turn his argument now takes against another primitive author, who would, of all others, be the most natural object of his aversion, as being the most opposed to all his ecclesiastical notions, Ignatius.[8] His attack upon this Father is made with all the dexterity of a polemic. He endeavours to excite an evil impression of the genuineness of the Letters in the first instance,

[1] Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 1, c. ii. §§ 2, 3.

[2] Vind. Ignat. Part I. c. iv.

[3] "Ii sunt Apostoli et Episcopi et Doctores et Ministri."—Hermas, Vis. iii. § 5.

[4] Ὁ γὰρ ταῦτα ποιῶν, ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ δοξασθήσεται· ὁ ἐκεῖνα ἐκλεγόμενος μετὰ τῶν ἔργων αὐτοῦ συναπολεῖται.—Barnabas, § xxi.

[5] "Quoniam vita vestra per aquam salva facta est, et fiet."—Hermas, Vis. iii. § 3. Μακάριοι οἱ ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρὸν ἐλπίσαντες, κατέβησαν εἰς τὸ ὕδωρ.—Barnabas, § xi.

[6] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § vii. p. 339; IV. § xvii. p. 609.

[7] Clem. Rom. Ad Cor. I. § xxv.

[8] Daillé, p. 57.

by devolving upon them the suspicion attached to all antiquity whatever, which he had excited in the minds of his readers by an accumulation of the examples it supplies (many of those which he names very far-fetched) of fiction or fraud. Having created, therefore, this prejudice against the Epistles of Ignatius *in limine*, as he might against any ancient document whatever, and given them a bad name, he feels the way paved for the introduction of a specific objection, founded on the silence of the ancients with respect to them; confessing indeed (for he will be candid), that it is possible for one or even many Fathers to be ignorant of a previous writer, or knowing him, through inadvertence or design to make no mention of him; but still contending that, if a grave and learned author was altogether silent respecting the writings of one who was prior to him in date, when there was good reason for his not being silent about them, when those writings were celebrated either on account of the name of the writer or the subject of his argument, the probability is that no such writings were then in existence. He then applies this reasoning to the case of Ignatius, and maintains, that had the Epistles of which Eusebius speaks been extant in the time of Irenæus, he must have known of them; and treating, as he did, of the Godhead of the Creator, and the verity of Christ the Son, he would have produced out of them evidence against the heretics; as he actually does make use of Clemens' Epistle to the Corinthians, and Polycarp's to the Philippians; whereas he never mentions these at all. Neither would these Epistles, if they had been genuine, have escaped the notice of Clemens Alexandrinus, who frequently quotes even apocryphal books, nor of Tertullian; neither of whom speaks of them.[1]

But what if Irenæus does refer to them? What if the following paragraph occurs in that Father—the original Greek of Irenæus preserved, too, in Eusebius in this instance, which is important[2];—"Even as one of our brethren said, when condemned to the wild beasts, through the witness which he bare unto God, I am the corn of God, and I am ground by the teeth of wild beasts that I may be found pure bread—*σῖτός εἰμι Θεοῦ καὶ διʼ ὀδόντων θηρίων ἀλήθομαι, ἵνα καθαρὸς ἄρτος*

[1] Daillé, p. 58.
[2] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 36; Irenæus, V. c. xxviii. § 4.

εὑρεθῶ." And what if the very same passage, word for word, is found in our present copies of Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans,[1] showing that the "one of our brethren," the τις τῶν ἡμετέρων, as the Greek runs, was Ignatius? Oh! writes Daillé, I am aware of that passage; but it was introduced into the Epistle by the forger of it, to give it a colouring of truth. Ignatius is not named in it; and, moreover, it does not say, ut *scripsit* quidam de nostris, or ut in Epistolâ aliquâ dixit, but simply, ut dixit. But how gratuitous is this! The genuineness of the Epistles is denied because Irenæus does not quote them. He does quote them, is the reply. Yes, is the rejoinder; but as I insist that the Epistles are spurious, the quotation must have been made by the forger from Irenæus; not by Irenæus from the Epistles. Surely this is a begging of the question. With respect to the use of the expression, "said," instead of "wrote," as though the former term implied that Irenæus did not quote from any *written* document, but was merely recording a hearsay; that must be felt to be an objection which none would have raised but one who was greatly pressed for an argument; for who does not know that the word "said" is as often used to introduce a citation from a book as the word "wrote," or indeed much oftener? Nor is this all. Daillé is evidently not aware that any other reference to Ignatius can be supposed to exist in the writings of Irenæus besides this one. And he may be well excused in the supposition; for Bishop Pearson is under the same impression. Bishop Bull, however, who gleans after Bishop Pearson, has produced another passage in Irenæus,[2] which he thinks looks to one in the Epistle of Ignatius to Polycarp. The paragraph in Irenæus runs thus: "that it was a strange doctrine to the Gentiles that there was one God, and that his Word, naturally invisible, was made palpable and visible amongst men, and that he descended to death, even the death of the Cross."[3] The paragraph in Ignatius, which Bishop Bull considers to correspond to this, is, "Be more zealous than thou art; study the times; be in expectation of Him who is above time, not of time, invisible, yet visible to us, impalpable,

[1] Ignatius, Ad Romanos, § iv.
[2] Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 4, c. iii. § 6.
[3] Et hujus Verbum naturaliter quidem invisibilem, palpabilem et visibilem in hominibus factum, et usque ad mortem descendisse, mortem autem crucis. —Irenæus, IV. c. xxiv. § 2.

impassive, though a sufferer for us!"[1] Moreover the coincidence here, if one there is, is not of the same kind as the other, or liable to the same objection (such as it is) which Daillé advances; for Irenæus does not here quote, but simply alludes, in the way a man might do, who, having read the Epistles, found a phrase in them cleaving to his memory, which he took the liberty of adopting, without considering it necessary to make any formal acknowledgment of having done so.

But the nature of Irenæus' book, which was against heresies, pursues Daillé, would have caused him to find in Ignatius that which might have been turned to account; and therefore it is the more extraordinary that he should not speak of those Epistles. The heresies, however, on which these Epistles touch, are very simple; merely that which denied the Divinity, and that which denied the Humanity of Christ; whilst those with which Irenæus deals are most elaborate and complicated. Besides, why should it be more extraordinary that he should not dwell on Ignatius (for allude to him, we have seen, he does) than that he should not once even refer to Barnabas, to Quadratus, to Aristides, to Melito, and numbers more whose works might have been known to Irenæus, or rather must have been known, for many of them were very famous in the Church, and some of them might have supplied him with matter quite as much to his purpose as Ignatius?

But the case does not after all rest on any such narrow ground as one quotation or one allusion in Irenæus. Polycarp, in his Epistles to the Philippians, an authority rather earlier than Irenæus, speaks expressly of the Epistles of Ignatius as having been sent to him by Ignatius himself[2]; which is decisive against Daillé and his "said," instead of "wrote;" and proves that written Epistles there were for Irenæus to read. And not only does Polycarp give a general description of their contents, but uses many phrases and peculiar forms of speech, which have a close relation to others found in the Epistles, and in our present copies of them. As, for instance, Polycarp in his Epistle speaks of Ignatius and his companions, as persons bound in bonds such as become saints (*τοῖς ἁγιοπρεπέσι δεσμοῖς,*) and are unto them diadems (*ατινά ἐστι διαδήματα.*)[3]

[1] Τὸν ἀόρατον, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς ὁρατὸν, τὸν ἀψηλάφητον, τὸν ἀπαθῆ, τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς παθητόν.—Ad Polycarpum, § iii.

[2] Polycarp, Ad Philipp. § xiii.

[3] § i.

Ignatius speaks of his being bound θεοπρεπεστάτοις δεσμοῖς,[1] of wearing bonds which are spiritual jewels (τοὺς πνευματικοὺς μαργαρίτας).[2] From whence it would seem that in these cases Polycarp was adopting, without any formal profession of it, the phraseology of Ignatius, of whom he was speaking. This is the kind of concurrence in expression which is to be detected on a comparison of their writings. Bishop Pearson will furnish you with other examples of it.[3]

But Clemens Alexandrinus, continues Daillé, never quotes these Epistles, and he was in the habit of citing even apocryphal books. What reasoning, however, is this! that because he quotes some books, it must be expected of him to quote all then in circulation; and that it must be concluded those which he did not quote did not exist! Undoubtedly Clemens, as I have said already, was one of those people that struggle with whole libraries; and numerous are the authors which he quotes or mentions; but there are very many whose works are known to have been then in being, whom he passes over in silence. He refers to the Epistle of Barnabas[4]; to the Shepherd of Hermas[5]; to the Epistle of Clemens Romanus[6]; to Irenæus, though not by name[7]; to Tatian[8]: but I do not believe he has a single allusion to Justin, to Athenagoras, to Theophilus, to Apollinarius, to Hegesippus, and to many more distinguished writers who had preceded him, whom it would be very easy to enumerate.

Tertullian, again, gives no token of knowing him, continues Daillé, and Bishop Pearson acquiesces in this; at least he brings no instance to the contrary. Yet there is a passage in Tertullian which very much resembles one in Ignatius. It is in the "De Carne Christi," and is as follows:—Tertullian is speaking of the nature of Christ—"Wherefore, the possession of both the one substance and the other exhibited Him as Man and God: on the one hand, born; on the other, not born: on the one hand, carnal; on the other, spiritual; on the one hand, weak; on the other, exceedingly strong: on the one hand, dying; on the other, alive."[9] Now certainly the phraseology, as well as the antithesis, very much resembles

[1] Ignatius, Ad Smyrn. § xi.
[2] Ad Ephes. § xi.
[3] Vind. Ign. Part I. c. v.
[4] Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xx. pp. 489, 490.
[5] I. § xvii. p. 369.
[6] I. § vii. p. 339.
[7] I. § xxii. p. 410.
[8] III. § xii. p. 547.
[9] Tertullian, De Carne Christi, c. v.

a passage in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians. "There is one Physician, bodily and spiritual; created and not created; God in the flesh; a real life in death; both of Mary and of God; at first capable of suffering, then incapable."[1] The resemblance, I mean, is such as would be very naturally accounted for by the supposition, that Tertullian wrote the paragraph with a recollection on his mind of having read such a passage in Ignatius.

And why should Daillé stop suddenly short at Tertullian?[2] Why should he not go on to Origen, the next Father in order, and being also prior to Eusebius, just as important to produce as the others he had named? Can it be because Origen not only bears testimony, but bears direct and repeated testimony to the Epistles of Ignatius, not to the *sayings* in this case, but, I repeat, to the Epistles of Ignatius; quoting on two occasions passages now found in our copies? Surely the suppression of so material a witness, of whom he must have been cognisant (because he happens to be against him), may be the proceeding of one who has determined to support a cause right or wrong, but cannot be that of one who is in the honest search of truth. The first of these passages is in Origen's Prologue to his Commentary on the Canticles. "Finally, we recollect that a certain one of the saints, Ignatius by name, said of Christ, 'My love is crucified;' nor do I think him deserving of reproof for this." Accordingly, we find in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans the expression, Ὁ ἐμὸς ἔρως ἐσταύρωται.[3] It is true that his Commentary on the Canticles now only exists in the Latin; and in a work of Daillé's subsequent to this one on the use of the Fathers,[4] a work in which he investigates the question of the authority of the Epistles of Ignatius at length, and to which Bishop Pearson's "Vindiciæ Ignatianæ" was a reply,[5] he examines the testimony of Origen (his subject in this instance forcing him to do so, and making suppression impossible), and denies that the Commentary on the Canticles was written by Origen, or was ever written in Greek at all. I cannot here stay to give you Bishop Pearson's refutation of this gratuitous supposition of Daillé's: suffice it to say, that he produces in de-

[1] Ignatius, Ad Ephes. § vii.
[2] Daillé, p. 58.
[3] Ignatius, Ad Rom. § vii.
[4] De Scriptis quæ sub Dionysii Areopagitæ et Ignatii Antiocheni nominibus circumferuntur libri duo. 4to. Genevæ, 1666.
[5] Vind. Ign. Procem. c. i.

tail the several characteristics of Origen's style, which is quite peculiar, and shows that the Commentary bears all the marks of it—whilst the other part of the supposition, equally gratuitous, that the Commentary never was composed in Greek at all, receives a complete refutation from a fragment of the original Greek still preserved in the Philocalia,[1] and which perfectly corresponds to a passage (freely rendered) in the second book of this disputed translation of the Commentary.[2] The other passage in Origen which bears testimony to the Epistles of Ignatius is in a homily on St. Luke. "I meet with an elegant expression in the Epistle of the same martyr," (not in this instance again, "a saying,") "I mean Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, second after Peter, and who suffered persecution by having to fight with wild beasts at Rome, 'the virginity of Mary escaped the knowledge of the Prince of this world.'" And accordingly the very sentence is found in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians, as we have it.[3] But here, again, the passage of Origen, like the other, was only known to exist in the Latin; which again caused Daillé, in the treatise I before alluded to, and which was subsequent to this book of his, which we are now upon, to demur to its authority, as before. Bishop Pearson replies to the objection again in a manner perfectly satisfactory. But it has happened *ex abundanti* that since Bishop Pearson's time the very passage in question was discovered as a fragment by Grabe in the *Greek.* and was communicated by him to the Benedictine editor of Origen's works, where it now appears.[4] This argument to the confirmation of Bishop Pearson, and further confusion of Daillé, is noticed by Dr. Routh in his preface to the "Reliquiæ Sacræ."[5]

The manner in which Daillé expresses himself in the part of the "De Usu Patrum," which I am now examining, does not warrant us in supposing that he disputed our copies of

[1] A collection of questions and answers made from different books of Origen by SS. Basil and Gregory, printed at the end of the Cambridge Ed. of Origen against Celsus.

[2] Sed pro rebus aut materiis subjacentibus, (Sol) aut illuminat aliquid luce, aut infuscat et obdurat aliquid ardore. Secundum hæc ergo fortassis et indurasse dicitur Deus cor Pharaonis, &c.—Origenis Comment. in Canticum Canticorum, vol. iii. p. 51, Bened. Ed.

Πρόσχες δὲ καὶ τούτοις, ὅτι ὁ ἥλιος λευκὸς καὶ λαμπρὸς ὤν, δοκεῖ τὴν αἰτίαν ἔχειν τοῦ μελανοῦν, οὐ παρ' ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τὸν, ὡς ἀποδεδώκαμεν, μελανούμενον· οὕτω δὲ καὶ μή ποτε σκληρύνει Κύριος τὴν καρδίαν Φαραώ, κ.τ.λ.—Origenis Philocal. c. xxvii.

[3] Ignatius, Ad Ephes. § xix.

[4] Origen. Homil. vi. in Lucam. vol. iii. p. 938.

[5] Rel. Sacr. vol. i. pp. xxi. xxii.

these Epistles being the same which Eusebius at least saw.[1] Indeed, he admits in his subsequent work that they are the same,[2] as though Eusebius, a consideration which Bishop Pearson presses on him with very great force, was not competent to detect the imposture[3]—Eusebius, whose knowledge of Greek literature was most conspicuous, πολυμαθέστατος ἱστωρ, as Sozomen calls him; the intimate friend of Pamphilus, who was the greatest collector of ecclesiastical authors of his time; the correspondent to whom Constantine applies for manuscript copies of the Scriptures, when he wanted them for his library at Constantinople; the scholar who wore his life out amongst books and parchments; as though he was taken in by these forgeries, and it was reserved for Daillé to find them out. Accordingly, his argument spends itself in damaging their credit before the time of Eusebius, in showing that those with which Eusebius was conversant were spurious. There is no need, therefore, to enter into the proofs which the language of Eusebius affords, that his copies at any rate are ours[4]: to describe how he speaks of them at length, and in detail; tells us where each of the Epistles was written (for they were written in more places than one); who were the Bishops at the time of the several Churches to which they are addressed; quotes long passages from them: thus furnishing many data by which we can institute a comparison between the Epistles known to Eusebius and those in our own possession—the result of which is, that they appear to be the same. There is no need, I say, on the present occasion to pursue this matter further. Enough has been said to show that Daillé deals out his denunciations of forgery with much too liberal a hand, and that the readers of his book "De Vero Usu Patrum" need not lose all heart about the study of ecclesiastical antiquity because they find him representing it as so little to be trusted. Let them explore the question for themselves, by mastering for themselves the primitive documents which are of good repute, and I undertake to say that they will then rise from the perusal of Daillé very often, perhaps generally, with a feeling that he is a special pleader, and has a cause to make good.

[1] His words are, "Quo exemplo non minus validè argumentamur supposititias esse eas epistolas, quæ jam ab Eusebii seculo Ignatii nomine circumferuntur."—p. 58.

[2] Vind. Ign. I. c. ii. [3] c. viii.

[4] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 36.

LECTURE IV.

Fourth argument of Daillé. Vagueness of it. The Fathers disposed of in the same way by Priestley. Paucity of MSS. Antiquity of some of the Versions. Improbability that the Fathers previous to Cyprian have been tampered with by the Romanists. Discussion of passages claimed as favourable to Romish views. The writings of Irenæus full of evidence against them. His appeal to tradition the same as that of the Church of England. The writings of Clemens occasionally corrupt. Discussion of passages in them claimed by the Romanists. Germ of Romish errors discoverable in Clemens. The same remark true of Tertullian. But neither his writings nor those of Hippolytus in a condition satisfactory to a Romish interpolator.

DAILLÉ has been hitherto chiefly contemplating entire spurious works as distinguished from such as are genuine; and has been expatiating upon the difficulty even in this case of discriminating the false from the true; but he has not yet done with this argument of forgery, and the plea it affords for damaging the credit of the Fathers. Accordingly he now proceeds to another branch of it, and contends that if it is difficult to decide even upon the genuineness of whole books (which was the consideration we were dealing with in the last Lecture), how much more, upon all the component parts of even unsuspected books, what has been interpolated, and what expunged in them[1]; yet, until this has been done, the real sentiments of the author can never be attained; not to speak of the errors of transcribers in the copies that have been made during ten or a dozen centuries, and the depredations on the manuscripts occasioned by moths, worms, decay.

I notice all this, for the same reason I before noticed his array of fictitious works (works which everybody allows to be fictitious), simply in order to show the *animus* of the man, and the determinate exaggeration with which he states his case against the Fathers. For who does not see that most or all of these objections bear, if not with equal strength yet certainly with great strength, against the genuineness of all an-

[1] Daillé, pp. 59, 60.

cient books whatever, even of the Scriptures themselves, and reduce one to principles of universal scepticism? Nothing is more easy than to throw out a charge that a book is interpolated, when the subject-matter of it does not happen to suit our taste; and in the case of an ancient book, nothing is more difficult than to disprove the objection by any distinct evidence. The expedient may serve the turn of Daillé, in order to dispose of testimony on the Romish question, which he might fancy was inconvenient, and those who think with him might feel inclined to favour his temerity; but the same expedient might serve the turn of a Priestley equally well, and was in fact employed by him to extinguish evidence which the same quarter supplies on the Socinian question and the Divinity of the Son, so that it is a dangerous edge-tool to use. "We find nothing like Divinity ascribed to Christ before Justin Martyr," says Dr. Priestley.[1]—But the Epistle of Barnabas is against you?—Yes, but the text and translation of that Epistle are interpolated. And the Epistle of Clemens Romanus? But the manuscript of Clemens is faulty. And the Epistles of Ignatius? But the numerous passages in which the Divinity of Christ is clearly confessed in those Epistles are foisted in, every one of them. "Having by this compendious process," says Mr. Wilson in his "Illustration of the method of explaining the New Testament by the early opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ,"[2] "reduced the Apostolical Fathers to his own theological standard, he next actually reckons on their *silence*, a silence of his own creation, in favour of his own opinions; and confidently affirms that 'we find nothing like Divinity ascribed to Jesus Christ before the time of Justin Martyr.'" "The most extraordinary method," adds Mr. Wilson, "of conducting an historical inquiry that ever was adopted." The remarks of Daillé, however, ultimately settle on the question, not of accidental, but of fraudulent interpolation or mutilation of ecclesiastical authors.[3]

The manuscripts of the early Fathers are in general few in number,[4] so that we cannot find any strong argument against

[1] History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. i. p. 32.

[2] Wilson, pp. 282, 283. Cambridge. 1838.

[3] Daillé, pp. 63. 65, *et seq.*

[4] I perceive almost all the editors complain of this.

In summâ quâ laborant Patres Apos-

those who throw out charges of interpolation or mutilation from the universal consent of a multitude of manuscripts; but then we have, in several instances, the check of early translations of these Fathers. We have nearly the whole of Barnabas both in the Greek and Latin—the Latin barbarous enough, no doubt, and occasionally defective, but early; at least before the year 900, when the corruptionists, according to Daillé, had scarcely begun their work.[1] We have the Shepherd of Hermas in a Latin version only; but that version most ancient, probably the one through which the work itself was known to the Latin writers of the Primitive Church[2]; and we have very many passages of the original Greek text preserved in other authors as fragments, by which the fidelity of the old translation may in general be tested. We have again a very ancient version of the Epistles of Ignatius, the history of which, indeed, very remarkably illustrates the argument I am now using, and

tolici Codicum manu scriptorum penuriâ, utpote quorum non nisi singulis Clementis et Ignatii uti liceat, &c.—Jacobson, Patres Apostol. Monitum, p. vi.

Nolite vero oblivisci codicum manu scriptorum usu destitutum me id tantum egisse, ut, &c.—Hefele, Patres Apostol. Præf. p. 1.

Valde est dolendum quod pauci tantum supersunt in bibliothecis codices operum Justinianorum manu scripti.—Otto, Justin. Martyr. Prolegom. p. xxxi. And again—Interdum vero destitutus codicum manu scriptorum auxilio—hoc maxime accidit in Apologiis et in Dialogo, quorum, quod sane dolendum, non extant nisi duo codices scripti iique recentiores ac sibimetipsis consimillimi, &c.—Hefele, Patres Apostol. Præf. pp. xlviii. xlix.

It should appear from Archbishop Potter's address to the Reader that he had met with few MSS. of Clemens Alexandrinus. Manu scripta, quæcunque reperire potui, exemplaria diligenter perlegi. And these consisted of a MS. of the Cohortatio and of the two last books of the Pædagogue in New College Library, a MS. of the three books of the Pædagogue in the Bodleian, and another, almost the same, in the King's Library. Scriptum Stromatum exemplar nullum oculis meis perlustrare hactenus licuit. But Bernard Montfaucon had sent him a list of various readings, non solum ex Ottoboniano, qui eorum prolixiora quædam Fragmenta, sed ex Parisiensi etiam codice, qui integrum Stromatum opus complectitur.

The MSS. used in Priorius' edition of Tertullian, which has for its basis that of Rigaltius, are the Codices Claudii Puteani et Petri Pithœi, and the Fuldensian, the Codex Agobardi, the Codex Fulvii Ursini, the Codex Divionensis. But these appear to have been the MSS. of parts of Tertullian, not of his entire works.

The MSS. of Irenæus seem to be more numerous for the Latin version than for the Greek text: Non minor in recognoscendâ eâ parte Græci textûs, quæ extat, cura fuit adhibita, quamvis deficientibus MSS., minori successu.—Præf. ad Edit. Benedict. p. viii.

The MSS. of Cyprian are numerous. Baluzius who furnished the text chiefly or altogether of the Benedictine edition, præter codices MSS. qui Pamelio, Rigaltio et Anglis usui fuerant, alios circiter triginta in subsidium sibi adhibuit.—Præf. ad Edit. Benedict. p. iv.

[1] Preface to Russel's Ed. p. viii.

[2] Russel, p. 126. Cotelerius' Opinion.

shows by example the singular value of these early translations in preserving the original text entire. For this version having been discovered before any copy of the Greek text of the shorter Epistles of Ignatius had come to light, on being compared with the Greek text of the Interpolated Epistles, which was already known, served to detect the interpolations, and enabled Usher, in a new edition, to weed them all out, and expose them by printing them in red ink. His corrections, thus obtained, were confirmed by the discovery of the Greek text of the shorter Epistles soon afterwards at Florence. We may, however, observe in passing, that these interpolations bear no mark of having been made for the purpose of upholding any Romish articles of faith or practice; nor is it easy to find that any principle of any kind guided their contrivers in the fabrication of them.

Of Justin Martyr we have no early Latin translation to refer to; but Justin bears no marks of having been tampered with by the Romanists. There is only one passage in his works which could be even suspected of having been submitted to their manipulation[1]—a passage which has certainly been produced by Romanists as favouring the worship of angels, but it has no appearance whatever of interpolation—the argument is consecutive and unbroken—and if in reply to heathens who charged the Christians with atheism, Justin, in his zeal to show that they were no atheists, should say, not only that they worshipped God the Father, God the Son, and the Holy Ghost, but also *ex abundanti* should touch upon their belief in angels, what wonder? But if the Romanists had introduced the paragraph respecting the angels in order to cover their practice of worshipping them, would they not have so worded it, as to make the meaning they intended to impart to it, clear? Whereas, the fact is, that many scholars, as Grabe, Cave, and Le Nourry, though a Benedictine, consider the passage to admit of a translation perfectly consistent with the Protestant doctrine, punctuation having much to do with it[2]; and Bishop Bull, who discusses it at great length,[3] so far from contending that it is corrupt, rests his interpretation mainly on its relation to the context, which the Romanists, he considers, had not

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 6.

[2] See the note in Chevallier's translation of the Apology, p. 178, and Bishop Kaye's, in p. 53 of his Justin Martyr.

[3] Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 2, c. iv. § 8.

taken sufficiently into their consideration; a line of argument, as it will be at once perceived, utterly opposed to any notion of interpolation. Moreover, if the Romanists adulterated this passage, how came they to leave untouched another in Justin, occurring in the same Apology, and within a few pages of the first,[1] the parallel to it and comment upon it, a passage which clearly limits the objects of Christian worship to the three Persons of the Trinity? Or how happened they to permit another passage to stand in the "Legatio pro Christianis" of Athenagoras, which is almost the counterpart of this of Justin —the same objection encountered, the same answer supplied, the three Persons of the Trinity still the objects of the Christian worship, and the Christian belief asserted besides (just in the manner it is done by Justin according to the Protestant and Bishop Bull's rendering), in the existence of angels?[2] How did this passage escape their mischievous pains, especially as Justin's genuine, as well as reputed works, are usually found, more or fewer of them, comprised in the same manuscript as the work of Athenagoras?[3] On the other hand, if the Romanist was busy with Justin's writings, how came he to leave in them passages to his own confusion? Thus in opposition to any doctrine of Transubstantiation, he speaks of the elements in the Eucharist as food liquid and solid[4]—as memorials of Christ's Body and Blood[5]—as oblations (if oblations) of fruits of the earth.[6] In opposition to the Communion in one kind only, he expressly asserts that both the bread and the wine were administered to all present.[7] In opposition to a Service of the Church in an unknown tongue, he bears clear testimony to that of the Primitive Church being in a tongue understood of all—"We all rise up together, and offer up our prayers in common."[8] In opposition to the doctrine of Purgatory, he represents it as a saying of Jesus, "In whatsoever state I shall find you, in that shall I judge you;" *i. e.* find you at the day of death; as the context plainly proves.[9] And in another place, when declaring the freedom of the will, by which all creatures, who enjoy it, are rendered responsible, he says, "We

[1] Justin Martyr, Apolog. I. § 13.
[2] Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, § 10.
[3] See Otto, Prolegom. p. xxxi. *et seq.* De Justini codicibus manu scriptis.
[4] Justin Martyr, Dialog. § 117.
[5] § 70.
[6] § 41.
[7] Apolog. I. § 65.
[8] § 67.
[9] Dialog. § 47.

men (and the same is true of angels) shall be self-condemned, if we transgress, unless we forestall our condemnation by repentance in time;"[1] as though the work of penitence was to be finished here. And in opposition to vows of celibacy, clerical, conventual or monastic, occurs a paragraph scarcely consistent with the exaction or recognition of such vows at that time: "There are many, both men and women, sixty and seventy years of age, who, having been Christians from their childhood (an incidental argument, by the by, for *Infant* Baptism), still continue undefiled."[2] The term "many," could hardly have been used, had the fact been that whole classes of persons had been living all their days in celibacy by the very condition of their calling.

The passages in Irenæus, to which any such suspicions as these, which Daillé is starting, would be most likely to attach, are very few—one which the Romanists certainly claim as favouring the pretensions of the supremacy of the Church of Rome, and one or two others which they claim also as favouring the adoration of the Virgin.[3] The first is the well-known phrase, "ad hanc enim ecclesiam propter potiorem principalitatem necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam."[4] But I explained in ample detail in my second Lecture, that no such doctrine as that of the supremacy of the Church of Rome, as asserted in modern times, is conveyed in this phrase; the drift of the argument being against it, and other passages of Irenæus inconsistent with it. I shall not, therefore, repeat what I then said, but content myself with remarking, that Romish interpolators must have been very ill fitted for the task they had imposed on themselves, if they did their work in such a manner as to leave the paragraph they had to deal with, after all, not only capable of receiving an interpretation against them, but naturally disposed to receive it; and moreover allowed other passages in the same author to remain unerased and unmodified, which are not to be reconciled with the doctrine they were attempting to fasten on Irenæus in one instance; not to say that anybody accustomed to the style of that most ancient, but most bald and barbarous translation, in which the writings of Irenæus for the most part survive, as they do in the case

[1] Ἐὰν μὴ φθάσαντες μεταθώμεθα.—Dialog. § 141.

[2] Apolog. I. § 15.

[3] See Pref. to Benedict. Ed. of Irenæus.

[4] Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 2.

before us, would not see any intrusive patch here, anything which is not of a piece with the rest. Monkish Latin was, no doubt, often bad Latin enough; but you want here not only bad Latin, but bad Latin of a very peculiar character; antiquated, and at the same time hobbling under the constraint of a close translation of an author not easy to be translated even with latitude, and made by one whose vocabulary appears to be very limited and unequal to the business before him. The principal one of the passages to which I alluded is as follows, —it is a parallel between the Virgin Eve and the Virgin Mary. "For as she (Eve) was seduced by the discourse of the angel to fly from God, and disobey his word, so the latter (Mary) was instructed by the discourse of the angel to bear (portaret) God, and be obedient to his word. And if the one was disobedient to God, the other was induced to obey God, that the Virgin Mary might become the *advocate of the Virgin Eve.* And as the human race was delivered up to death by a virgin, by a virgin it is saved, the scales being even, a virgin's disobedience and the obedience of a virgin."[1] Irenæus is here engaged in refuting certain heretics, who maintained that the God who created the world and gave the law, was not the same as the Supreme God who gave the Gospel. He therefore shows that their identity is evident from the constant connection which is maintained between the Old Testament and the New, and the close relation which the one bears to the other. Thus, as sin was brought into the world by the disobedience of a virgin (Eve), according to the Old Testament—Eve being supposed a virgin when she ate of the tree—so according to the New Testament was it abated to the world by the obedience of a virgin (Mary) who was made to bear God incarnate in her womb, and by so doing became the advocate of Eve, not that she was herself the intercessor of Eve in heaven, but simply that by having given birth to the Saviour, she became the repairer of all the damage that Eve had done to herself and to mankind. Another passage, which is nearly to the same effect, occurs in Bk. III. c. xxii. § 4; and if rightly interpreted, con-

[1] Et si ea inobedierat Deo; sed hæc suasa est obedire Deo, uti virginis Evæ virgo Maria fieret advocata. Et quemadmodum adstrictum est morti genus humanum per virginem, salvatur per virginem, æquâ lance dispositâ, virginalis inobedientia per virginalem obedientiam. (I take the reading as given in the Benedictine edition, the variæ lectiones not affecting the argument.)—Irenæus, V. c. x x. § 1.

veys the same meaning; viz. that the Virgin Mary was the remote cause of the salvation of the human race, herself amongst the number, by having given birth to the Saviour. And the same meaning is to be assigned to a third paragraph of a similar description, which, however, the Romanists do not claim for the Virgin, thinking the term virgo, in this instance, applies to the Church, as it possibly does.[1] Whilst on the other hand, Irenæus, on another occasion, shows himself so far from an idolater of the Virgin, that he makes an incident in her history not flattering to herself, expressly tributary to his argument, and treats it in a manner rather calculated to depress than to exalt unduly her character and name. For when urging against the Gnostics, who separated Jesus from Christ, the identity of the two as manifested by the precision with which Jesus Christ executed at the proper time and opportunity the will of the Father, a precision which could not have had effect if there had been a division in his Person, Irenæus illustrates as follows:—"For nothing is done by him out of order and season, even as nothing is done impertinently by the Father. For all things are foreknown by the Father, and are wrought out by the Son, as time and circumstance suit. Accordingly, when Mary was making too much haste towards the wonderful miracle of the wine, and was desirous to partake of the cup created on the instant (compendii poculo[2]) before the time, the Lord checked her unseasonable hurry, and said, 'What is that to me and to thee? mine hour is not yet come.'"[3] What I mean to observe is, that had Irenæus been impressed with those feelings for the Virgin which have prevailed and still do prevail in the Church of Rome, he would not have gone out of his way to choose this scene in her life for the exemplification of his argument, when so many other particulars recorded of our Lord would have served his turn equally well, or having done so, he would not have volunteered a description of it in terms of some aggravation.

Besides, had the Romanists meddled to any extent with the writings of Irenæus, would they have left them, after all, full of evidence against themselves? for so they are. I have already produced a passage from them entirely inconsistent with the doctrine of Transubstantiation[4]; others, with the use of the

[1] Quæ est ex virgine per fidem, regenerationem.—Irenæus, IV. c. xxxiii. § 4.

[2] III. c. xi. § 5.

[3] c. xvi. § 7.

[4] Lecture II. p. 33.

secret Confessional[1]; another with that of images in the Service of the Church.[2] I may now add, that jealous as the Romanist has been and is of the free circulation of the Scriptures, had he been modelling Irenæus to his taste, he would not have overlooked in him the following paragraph, "Of every tree of the garden ye shall eat, saith the Spirit of God, *i. e. feed on every Scripture* of the Lord's."[3] Or, scandalized as the ecclesiastical power of Rome was, even in early times, by the title of Antichrist given to it by its enemies, he would scarcely have allowed the conjecture with respect to the name of this mysterious agent to stand unmolested in the text of Irenæus; I mean that which intimated that it might be Λατεῖνος, a name that answered to the number 666, and was that of the last of the Prophetical kingdoms, the kingdom then subsisting[4]; liable as such a conjecture evidently was to be made use of against the Church. Would the same party, being an interpolator as well as amputator of this author, have suffered Irenæus to touch repeatedly, as he does, on the intermediate state between death and judgment, the receptacle and the condition of departed spirits, without the remotest hint offered of a purgatory?[5] It might have happened, no doubt, that the absence of all allusion to a purgatory would have furnished no ground for the argument I am maintaining; there might have been no call or opportunity for making it, but when his subject most naturally, and almost necessarily, led him to speak of the doctrine, had he entertained it, his silence becomes expressive, and we cannot but believe that the interpolator, had there been one, would have taken care to break it. Again, would he have permitted any passage to stand, which might testify that the Holy Communion was administered in both kinds in the days of Irenæus, whilst his own Church administered it only in one kind? And yet we find Marcus, the heretic, represented as exciting in all present an eager desire to *taste the cup*; his own administration being, no doubt, a caricature of that of the Church, and reflecting its several features.[6] Would he have left untouched a paragraph

[1] Irenæus, I. c. xiii. §§ 5. 7.
[2] c. xxv. § 6.
[3] V. c. xx. § 2.
[4] Nihil de eo affirmamus. Sed et Λατεῖνος nomen habet sexcentorum sexaginta sex numerum: et valde verisimile est, quoniam novissimum regnum hoc habet vocabulum. Latini enim sunt qui nunc regnant.—V. c. xxx. § 3.
[5] See Irenæus, V. c. xxxi. § 2; IV. c. xxii. § 1; c. xxvii. § 2; c. xxxiii. § 1; I. c. xxvii. § 3.
[6] I. c. xiii. § 2.

which speaks of a certain Deacon of the brethren in Asia having his *wife* seduced[1]: and another, which numbers among the tenets of the heretical Ἐγκρατεῖς, or Continents, the *prohibition of marriage*[2]; his own Church all the while showing itself inimical to the marriage of ecclesiastics, and in general the unscrupulous abettor of vows of celibacy? Would he have found no cause in the practice of his own Church with respect to the invocation of angels and saints for suppressing or altering the text of Irenæus in many places in relation to this subject? Would the following passage have been left alone? "Neither does the Church do anything by the *invocation of angels*, nor by incantations, nor by any other evil and curious art; but directing her prayers to the Lord who made all things, chastely, purely, openly; and invoking the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, she performs her great acts for the benefit, not the seduction of mankind."[3] Or this other? "The Father had no need of angels to make the world, and to fashion man for whom the world was made. Neither, again, had he any need of their services for the formation and arrangement of the things pertaining to man. For he had an ample and unutterable ministration (in himself). For his own Progeny, his Word and Similitude, the Son and the Holy Ghost, the Word and Wisdom, *whom all angels serve and are subject unto*, are his ministers."[4] For though, possibly, the Church of Rome might subscribe to the literal terms of this paragraph, yet the spirit of it is adverse to the very prominent position she assigns to angels in her system: as are other paragraphs in Irenæus, which ascribe whatever knowledge the angels and even archangels possess of the Father to the disclosure of it made to them by the Son,[5] from whom all such knowledge is entirely derived.[6] Whilst with respect to saints, would he not at any rate have introduced the term itself more frequently into his author? For so far from any indication of the worship of saints transpiring in Irenæus, it is remarkable how very sparing he is even in the designation. In quoting even the Apostles, for instance, (an observation which may be extended to the early Fathers in general,) his manner is almost always, "Paulus ait," or "Petrus ait," or occasionally "Paulus Apos-

[1] Irenæus, I. c. xiii. § 5.
[2] c. xxviii. § 1.
[3] II. c. xxxii. § 5.
[4] IV. c. vii. § 4.
[5] II. c. xxx. § 9.
[6] IV. c. vi. § 7.

tolus," once ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος,[1] but even this a singular expression for Irenæus, and one that attracts our attention as being such; and though he does make use of the epithet sometimes, and in connection with the Apostles, it is for the most part in a general way, οἱ μακάριοι ἀπόστολοι,[2] and very rarely as a prefix to the name of an individual.

Again on the question of tradition; it is not a phrase or two in Irenæus, that rises up to censure the Romanist, but a considerable portion of his work. Several of the early chapters of his third book are employed in discussing it, his controversy with the heretics bringing the limits, use, and abuse of it under examination; and so little favourable is the whole tenour of his argument to Romish views, that it is impossible to believe a Romish interpolator could have suffered it to stand as it does. Irenæus first speaks of the Apostles preaching the Gospel by word of mouth; but as this manner of publishing it would come to an end with their lives, he says they further committed it to *writing*. Matthew, γραφὴν ἐξήνεγκεν εὐαγγελίου. Mark, τὰ . . . κηρυσσόμενα . . . ἐγγράφως ἡμῖν παραδέδωκε. Luke, τὸ ὑπ' ἐκείνου κηρυσσόμενον εὐαγγέλιον ἐν βιβλίῳ κατέθετο. John, ἐξέδωκε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.[3] And these permanent documents, he tells us, were to be thenceforward *the pillar and ground of our faith*.[4] In case, therefore, of a debate arising as to what the faith or the truth was, Scripture is thus represented as the authority to appeal to. But the heretics, against whom Irenæus was contending, disputed that authority; alleged that Scripture sometimes contradicted itself, and that truth could not be come at, unless tradition were resorted to.[5] Irenæus describes the Church as not shrinking from this reference to tradition, but on the contrary as accepting the challenge, only demanding that the tradition be genuine. For the abuses to which tradition is liable, he exposes in another place. "The tradition of the elders," says he, "which they pretended to keep in accordance with the Law, was really

[1] Irenæus, V. c. ii. § 3.
[2] III. c. iii. § 3.
[3] c. i. § 1.
[4] Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos, per quos evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconaverunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis tradiderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum.—Ibid.
[5] Cum ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non rectè habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia variè sint dictæ, et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his, qui nesciant traditionem. —III. c. ii. § 1.

contrary to the law as given by Moses. And therefore Isaiah exclaims, 'Caupones tui miscent vinum aquâ,'[1] *i. e.* your elders mix the water of tradition with the pure Word of God, adulterating the Law and resisting it, as the Lord made manifest, saying to them, 'Why do ye transgress the commandment of God for the sake of your tradition?' And not only did they make the Law of God of none effect by their prevarication, mingling water with wine, but they established their own law instead, which is still called the Pharisaical. By which they take something from the Law; something they add to it; and something of it they interpret after a fashion of their own."[2] Thus alive to the value of tradition, but aware of the defects which attach to it, Irenæus represents the Church as respecting it, but first demanding a scrutiny into its character. Now the tradition to which the heretics appealed, was a secret tradition delivered by the Apostles *per vivam vocem* (as they pretended) to a favoured few, the τέλειοι; of which tradition they were themselves in exclusive possession; and this tradition, it is needless to add, coincided with their heretical opinions. On the other hand, Irenæus describes the Church as rejecting this tradition, not because it was tradition, but because it was tradition that had no marks of being genuine.[3] He, with the Church, maintained that the Apostles were not likely to exercise any reserve towards their own successors at least in the Churches, men of their own choice, selected to be governors of the Churches in their own stead; that they would surely have imparted to them not only the truth, but the whole truth: that accordingly in investigating tradition, the tradition of the Churches of which the Apostles had been themselves the founders should be preferred; its correct transmission should be guaranteed by the succession of its keepers being thoroughly known, and capable of being traced, one after another, to the time being; that such correctness would be rendered further satisfactory, if it could be shown that the descents through which it had passed were few, as could be done, for instance, in the Church of Ephesus, where John died at a very advanced age, so as to render the interval between his death, and Irenæus' writing, inconsiderable; or, as could be done in the Church of Smyrna, where Polycarp, who was

[1] Isaiah i. 22.
[2] Irenæus, IV. c. xii. § 1.
[3] Comp. Papias ap. Routh. Reliq. Sacr. vol. i. p. 8; and Eusebius' quotation of Clemens Alexandrinus, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 11.

John's disciple, lived to such a period, that Irenæus himself could actually remember him and the words he used; and though in the case of the Church of Rome, the series of Bishops between Peter and Paul, and the time of Irenæus, was longer, yet it was thoroughly well known, not a link of it wanting, whilst the conspicuous position and character of that Church, situated in the metropolis of the civilized world, the great central exchange, as it were, to which the traditions of all other Churches would be likely to converge, and be there compared, were eminently calculated to give certainty and consistency to the tradition which obtained in it. To these three Churches, therefore, Irenæus chooses to refer when in search of sound tradition; and thus does he fence his tradition about by various safeguards, by examining into its locality, whether Apostolical; into its transmission, whether through few descents, and those well ascertained; into its uniformity, whether identical in divers and distant Churches. To such tradition as this he will appeal as fearlessly as to Scripture against the heretics; and accordingly he does appeal to it on the questions at issue between the Gnostics and the Church, very cardinal questions of faith and doctrine, no doubt, as he would also have done on any other questions, had any others been at issue, however inferior in importance to these; for he expressly says, that "even if the dispute were concerning any small matter, recourse must be had to the oldest Churches."[1] Now from all this it seems to me that the Romanists occupy the ground taken up by the early heretics on the subject of tradition, as the Church of England, for I leave the defence of the foreign Protestant Churches to Daillé, occupies that taken up by the Primitive Church; and that it would be impossible for a Romish interpolator to be satisfied with the general tenour of the reasoning and of the testimony of Irenæus, or with the position in which it placed his own Church. For let us very briefly recapitulate. The heretics did not renounce the authority of the Scriptures, but contended that they did not yield out the truth to such as were ignorant of tradition; and accordingly to tradition they appealed. The Romanists say and do the same. The early Church did not object to the heretics' appeal to tradition, but only required that it should be genuine, testing its genuineness by starting

[1] Et si de aliquâ modicâ quæstione disceptatio esset, oporteret in antiquissimas recurrere ecclesias.—Irenæus, III. c. iv. § 1.

it from Apostolical sources; by tracing it through the steps of its descent, where the steps were few in number; and by comparing it in several independent Churches. Neither does the Church of England reject the Romanist's appeal to tradition, but adopts the principle herself; only she must have it free from all suspicion of being spurious; and accordingly she looks for it in the age nearest the Apostles; she has respect unto it only or chiefly for a few generations after the Apostles, and as manifested in the primitive Fathers, not in those of later date and corrupted times, her watchword being everywhere in the Homilies and elsewhere, "Scripture and the Primitive Church;" and she further is careful to gather it from the *consent* of those Fathers, as independent witnesses in several unconnected Churches. To the tradition *per vivam vocem*, of which the heretics represented themselves as the exclusive possessors, the Church of Irenæus demurred, as not standing the tests by which the Church tried tradition. To the tradition *per vivam vocem*, of which the Romanists regard themselves as the keepers, the Church of England objects, and upon the same grounds. It may be added, as a general remark, and without reference to the controversy between the Churches of England and Rome merely, that the subject on which tradition was called in to judge between the parties, in the case before us, was doctrines; and the shape, in which it showed itself as the witness of those doctrines, was in a creed.[1] The Church of England uses it still for the same purpose, and under the same form, viz. for the purpose of defining doctrines, and under the form of creeds. But it appears from one passage we have had before us from Irenæus, that tradition would have been called in by the early Church quite as readily, and with quite as much propriety, had circumstances required it, in lesser matters; such, we may presume, as in the cases of discipline, rite, or ceremony; and the Church of England does accordingly avail itself of tradition in this province also, agreeably to such precedent. On the whole, it is surely not to be expected that a Romish manufacturer of Irenæus would have been satisfied to present his article in a condition so acceptable to the Reformer, at least the English Reformer, and so far otherwise to the Church for which he was preparing it.

[1] Irenæus, III. c. iv. § 2.

With respect to Clemens Alexandrinus, I think no one could read him attentively and suppose that his text had been unfairly meddled with by the Romanists at least. It is probably often corrupt; and this corruption no doubt adds greatly to the natural obscurity and mysticism of the writer; but what is there in all his works even as they now stand, which would seem to betray the hand of the Romanist? There are some four places, I think, not more, which might be supposed to hint at a purifying discipline to which the soul must be subjected, if not before death, after it; but they are so far from explicit, that one is scarcely sure of their meaning. For instance, "the faithful man, even if he should escape from the flesh (*κἂν ἐξέλθῃ τὴν σάρκα*), must put away his passions in order to be able to proceed to his own abiding place."[1] Again, "the Gnostic withdrawn from such matters by the hope that is in him, does not taste of the good things of this world; despising all things here; pitying those who have to be disciplined after death, and brought to confession against their will through punishment inflicted on them."[2] Again, after disparaging the offerings made to the gods, of which the poets speak, offerings of fleshless bones, and burnt gall (*χολῆς πυρουμένης*), which our days would reject, and which were supposed to conciliate favour for the parties, even though they were pirates or thieves, he proceeds, "but we say that fire sanctifies not the flesh, but the sinful soul—fire that is, not which is mechanical and consumes, but which is discriminating (*φρόνιμον*,) and pervades the soul, which passes through it."[3] However, in another place, it may be remarked, Clemens speaks of knowledge (*γνῶσις*) nearly in the same terms, as he speaks of this *πῦρ φρόνιμον*; which I mention as indicating the mystical nature of this purgation or discipline, whatever it was. "Knowledge, therefore, is quick to purify, and qualified to work the change for the better, wherefore it easily translates the man to the divine and holy principle, which is congenial to the soul: and by a certain peculiar light passes him through the stages of initiation, until it sets him upon the crowning point of his rest, pure in heart; and teaches him to behold God with understanding and comprehension face to face. For this is the perfection of a Gnostic soul, that having made

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. VI. § xiv. p. 794.

[2] VII. § xii. p. 879.

[3] § vi. p. 851.

its way through purification and ministration, it should be with the Lord, and so be proximately subject to him."[1] It is possible, nay probable, from the general principle, which rules the writings of Clemens, viz. a disposition to communicate, as far as may be, to the heathens the Gospel through the medium of heathen philosophy, that one of the popular notions of that philosophy suggested to Clemens the idea here in question. But there is no reason to suppose for a moment that any *Romish* interpolator had been tampering with his text. A Romish interpolator meaning to uphold the doctrine of Purgatory would have been much more explicit than this. Neither, in general, would he have allowed so many other passages to keep their places in Clemens, which are utterly against his own faith or practice; which oppose, for instance, his most vital doctrine of all, that of Transubstantiation, over and over again, as I shall show when I come to speak of the Eucharist[2]; or which touch upon rites and ceremonies of heathen temples in a manner so greatly reminding us of some in his own Churches.[3] The truth is, that in the writings of Clemens may be detected the germ of several customs or opinions, which eventually became corrupt as exercised in the Romish Church; but which, as presented to us in him, are generally little more than unauthorized, yet still serve to intimate to us the use from which the abuse proceeded—*secret confession* from the ἐξομολόγησις or *public* confession of sins—the *Disciplina arcani* from the deep and *spiritual meaning*, which the Gnostic was taught to find in Scripture, as distinguished from the superficial sense, which was all that was discernible in it to the vulgar eye—the undue *exaltation of Saint Peter* above the other Apostles from such a casual expression applied to him in an early age, as "the blessed Peter, the elect, the chosen, the first of the disciples, for whom only and for himself the Saviour paid the tribute."[4] But the general plan and character of Clemens' works would render them extremely unpropitious to interpolation. What affects the Romanist at all, whether for good or harm, is incidental, inferential, unobtrusive. Nobody would know, from the complexion of the

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. VII. § x. p. 865.
[2] See Lecture XII. Second Series.
[3] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. ii. p. 252; Stromat. V. § vii. pp. 670, 671.
[4] Quis dives salvetur. § xxi. p. 947.

whole volume, where to look in it for a syllable to the purpose of such a controversy.

These latter remarks also hold with respect to Tertullian. We should find in him several traces of the future characteristics of the Church of Rome—mostly the unauthorized beginnings of customs or sentiments, which grew up to a vicious excess, and the eventual mischief of which could not be then foreseen (magnæ cunabula Romæ); few or none of these harbingers of future corruptions introduced in a way which a Romish interpolator would have propounded; some of them in a way which would have been positively offensive to him. We have the frequent use of the sign of the Cross[1] both on the person and even on the furniture; which was even then, it seems, liable to be mistaken (though hitherto a mistake it was, which could scarcely be said in the case of the Romish Church), for the worship of that emblem[2]—Prayers and offerings for the dead, and oblations in honour of the martyrs on the anniversaries of their martyrdom[3]; usages, which grew at length into mortuary masses and the actual sacrifice of the Host—Unwritten tradition, then recent, urged to the confusion of heretics, who mutilated or denied Scripture[4]; and urged, too, in support, not to the disparagement of Scripture[5]; which eventually grew to tradition as a rival of Scripture and a substitute for it—The intercession of martyrs in prison with the Church in behalf of persons suffering under its censure, to which the Church was disposed to listen with favour[6] (an indulgence, which even Tertullian, as a Montanist indeed, already regarded with jealousy[7]); which in time ripened into the merit of the works of supererogation of the saints—Celibacy and bodily mortifications, here perhaps commended[8]; which, by degrees, became the forced *vows* of the monk and nun, and produced, in fact, the crimes to which Tertullian himself points as the natural consequence of such vows, if they were compulsory[9]—The impossibility that the Churches (Ec-

[1] Tertullian, De Coronâ, c. iii.; Ad Uxor. II c. v.
[2] Apolog. c. xvi.
[3] De Coronâ, c. iii.; De Exhortat. Castitat. c. xi.; De Monogam. c. x.
[4] De Coronâ, c. iii.
[5] De Prescript. Hæret. c. xxv.
[6] Ad Martyres, c. v.
[7] De Pudicitiâ, c. xxii.
[8] De Patientiâ, c. xiii.; De Cultu Fœminar. II. c. ix.; De Resurrec. Carnis, c. viii.
[9] De Virgin. Veland. c. xiv.

clesias) should *all* fall into error, that is, that there should be an universal defection from the faith, asserted [1]; which in process of time was magnified into the infallibility of the Church of Rome—The mitigated sufferings, which are to be endured for the purgation of small offences (expressed by the uttermost farthing in the parable) between death and judgment intimated [2]; a notion, which, in due season, was enlarged into the whole apparatus of purgatory—The power of the keys conferred on Peter, and through him on the Church; on the Church, which thenceforth could give absolution [3]; in course of time exaggerated into Saint Peter and the successors of Saint Peter in the Papal chair, having the exclusive possession of those keys— a case which Tertullian even contemplates in order to deride, and compares to that of Janus of old [4]—The Church of Rome described as deserving of great respect, as possessing the very chairs of the Apostles, perhaps the autograph letters, certainly authentic copies of them, as the scene of the martyrdom of the Apostles, as in the enjoyment of a pure creed, as combining the Law and the Gospel [5]; these reasonable claims to regard urged to the confusion of heretics, who would not hold the traditions thus guaranteed to be safe; eventually puffed into unreasonable and arrogant pretensions of the Church of Rome to govern the faith of the whole world, ages after her traditions had become to a considerable degree unworthy of trust. The Romanist would hardly have contented himself with interpolations after this fashion, had he interpolated at all, especially as several of these seeds of Romish usages present themselves in the tracts of Tertullian, written when he had evidently become a Montanist; which is not the field the Romanist would have made choice of, in which to sow his tares, had he meditated doing his Church a service by clandestinely foisting his own peculiar tenets into the writings of this primitive author: much less would he leave in them passages which strongly reflect on his own proceedings and principles—passages over and over again occurring, which contradict *e. g.* the doctrine of Transubstantiation [6]: which refute the superiority of St. Peter, who is ac-

[1] De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxviii.
[2] De Animâ, c. lviii.
[3] Scorpiace, c. x.
[4] Ibid.
[5] De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxxvi.
[6] De Oratione, c. vi.; De Resurr. Carnis, c. xxxvi.; Contra Marcion. I. c. xiv.; III. c. ix. xix.; IV. c. xl.; De Animâ, c. xvii.

tually vindicated in one place as not inferior to St. Paul, as it might be supposed he was from St. Paul rebuking him, for that he was made equal with Paul by his martyrdom[1]: which ascribe the doctrine, that worship is to be paid to angels, actually to Simon Magus; and represent it as condemned by the Apostle Peter[2]: which are opposed to the adoration of the Virgin; so far from any undue reverence being assigned to her by Tertullian, such as is her right is scarcely conceded to her; her belief in the Saviour questioned[3]; her standing at the door desiring to speak with him construed into a disregard of his teaching whilst it was going on in the house[4]: which do not favour the multiplication of sacraments, the two of Baptism and the Eucharist being produced by themselves, and as if standing apart from all others[5]: which animadvert upon the practices of religious mendicants among the heathen in a manner which would be most unsatisfactory to the friars of the Church of Rome[6]: which actually designate Rome as the Babylon of St. John, great, proud, and the destroyer of saints[7]: which deny the necessity of the celibacy of the clergy[8]—this last, I will add, a fact the more to my purpose, because the Romanists actually took some pains to show, in the teeth of Jerome's assertion to the contrary, that Tertullian was not a Presbyter of the Church; his treatise "to his Wife" proving him at any rate to be married, and thus his example, if Jerome's testimony be admitted, opposing the Church of Rome in the restriction she lays upon the clergy—but still the Romanists endeavour to establish their point by argument, which is all fair; by producing certain paragraphs out of his works, which they contend (not, however, successfully), prove him to have been a layman[9]; but they make no attempt whatever to *suppress* the tract "Ad Uxorem," nor yet many other passages in him, which clearly testify against themselves, and sanction clerical marriage. These surely are not indications of an author who had been dishonestly handled by Romanists.

[1] De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxiv.
[2] c. xxxiii.
[3] De Carne Christi, c. vii.
[4] Adv. Marcion. IV. c. xix. See also De Carne Christi, c. xxiii.
[5] Adv. Marcion. IV. c. xxxiv.
[6] Apolog. c. xiii.
[7] Contra Judæos, c. ix.; De Cultu Fœminar. II. c. xiii.
[8] Ad Uxor. I. c. iii. vii.; De Monog. c. xii.; De Exhort. Castitat. c. vii.
[9] De Exhort. Castitat. c. vii.; De Monogam. c. xii.; but he may here be considered to identify himself with his clients rhetorically.

In the works of Hippolytus again, however they may want sifting and re-editing, there is nothing to lead us to suppose that the Church of Rome has been particularly busy with them. In the treatise "concerning the End of the World and concerning Antichrist," imputed to him, occurs an expression with regard to the Eucharist—that the priest sacrificed every day Christ's precious Body and Blood[1];—but such an expression would be very far from establishing the doctrine of Transubstantiation or excluding the use of *figurative* interpretation; especially whilst in an exposition of Proverbs ix., which is another of Hippolytus' works not disputed, he speaks on this same subject in such language as the following:—"She (Wisdom) hath furnished her table, *i. e.* Christ the Wisdom of God, hath furnished his table; to wit, (supplied) the knowledge of the sacred Trinity, which had been promised, and his precious and unpolluted Body and Blood, which, in the *mystical* and divine table, are daily sacrificed in *remembrance* of that first and ever-memorable table of the mystical supper"[2]—the furniture of the table being the *knowledge* of the Trinity, and the precious and unpolluted Body and Blood of Christ—the knowledge of the Trinity certainly a spiritual not a material viand—the precious and unpolluted Body and Blood, therefore, thus coupled with it, also spiritual and not material. There is another passage in Hippolytus which seems to imply the absence of such a doctrine as Purgatory from the mind of that Father.[3] And again, another,[4] in which the notable conjecture is hazarded that the name of the future Antichrist might be Λατεῖνος, a conjecture in which Irenæus, as we have seen, indulged before him, but one which, at any rate, so far as it conveys any meaning at all, would not be such as a member of the Latin Church would tolerate, but would be rather likely, if he meddled with the work at all, to suppress.

[1] Hippolytus, De Consummat. Mundi et Antichristo, § 41.
[2] Comment. in Prov. ix. 1. p. 282, Ed. Fabric.
[3] Adversus Græcos, pp. 220–222.
[4] De Christo et Antichristo, § 1.

LECTURE V.

State of the writings of Origen. Theory of their interpolation by the Romanists untenable. Their testimony against Transubstantiation; Prayers in a tongue not understood by the people; the withholding of the Scriptures; Disciplina arcani; the use of Images; Vows of celibacy; the Worship of saints or angels; Purgatory. First instance of Romish interpolation pointed out by James. Neglect of the early Fathers by the Romanists. Remark of Dodwell. The story of Paschasinus insufficient to support the inference drawn from it by Daillé.

FROM various causes, which I shall take another opportunity of dwelling a little upon, the writings of Origen have come down to us very greatly injured: a large part in a Latin translation avowedly unfaithful to the author: other portions, in the Greek, indeed, but whether, as at first penned and published by Origen himself, and not rather as notes taken down at the moment by standers-by, who were listening to this prolific disputant, may be doubted: even those treatises of his, which he certainly committed to paper, often concocted in haste, and seldom, perhaps, reviewed or revised —for he appears to have been very much on the move, and very careless about his manuscripts—and after all, his recorded sentiments not unfrequently maltreated, and his text vitiated by contemporary or all but contemporary heretics. Certainly one or other of these considerations affect many of the works of Origen as we now possess them, and detract from their value by shaking our confidence in their integrity. But this is by no means the case with them all. Some treatises have not been mistranslated, for we have them in the Greek—have not been composed in heat or haste, for they bear internal marks of care and deliberation—have not been meddled with by early heretics, for they are not on subjects

which invite their interference. But, however this may be, assuredly the abuses to which the works of Origen have been subjected, can hardly be supposed to have proceeded from the Romanists—testifying, as those works do, even as they stand, in so many particulars against the doctrines and practices of the Church of Rome. Indeed, how distasteful they are to the Romanist may be seen at once, by a perusal of the Preface to the second volume of the Benedictine Edition, and by the notice "caute lege," so often entered on the margin of the text.

I will lay before you some of the evidence on which I rest the assertion, that Origen cannot have suffered at the hands of Romish interpolators, at least, whatever he may have done at the hands of others; and I beg you once more to consider, whilst I am thus bringing the question to book, the credit due to that vague and indiscriminating charge against the Romanists, of tampering with these early authorities, circulated by Daillé and others of his school down to the present day, and which has the effect, as I have said, of damaging the character of the Fathers, and so neutralizing their testimony on subjects where it is unwelcome.

Thus, on *Transubstantiation*, I find Origen, when expounding the clause in the Lord's Prayer, "Give us this day our daily bread," referring, by way of illustration, to the sixth chapter of the Gospel of St. John, at some length, in confirmation of his view, that the bread is spiritual bread, not material; as also to several texts in St. Paul on meats, which he considers to point to the same conclusion, viz. that when expressing himself thus the Apostle "was not primarily speaking of corporal food, but of the words of God which nourish the soul."[1] When we recollect how constantly the sixth chapter of St. John is understood by the early Fathers in relation to the Eucharist, it cannot be supposed that Origen would express himself as he does here—and the whole section, of which this paragraph is a part, should be read, in order that the full force of the argument may be perceived—had he believed in the doctrine of the corporal presence. Again, on another occasion he objects to a material interpretation of such phrases as "the heavens were opened," "the voice of the Lord was heard," and says, that however some may take them in that

[1] Origen, De Oratione, § 27, vol. i. p. 245, Bened. Ed.

light, "those who search deeper will be aware that there is a certain divine perception, which the blessed discover and enjoy —a perception which has several senses—that of sight, which can discern things that are incorporeal; that of hearing, which can receive words not formed by the air; that of taste, which uses the living bread—the *bread which descends from heaven and giveth light unto the world.*"[1] This passage, again, is not conceived in the spirit of one who found the corporal presence in the Eucharist. Moreover, how could that man see the sacrifice of the mass in the Eucharist, who volunteers as a comment on John iv. 24, "God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth," the remark, "by which words Jesus taught that we ought not to worship God in the flesh, and with *fleshy sacrifices*?"[2] Or how, when speaking of the best manner of keeping the feasts, could he employ such language as that it was "by doing our duty, praying, and offering to God in our prayers *unbloody sacrifices*;"[3] the last a phrase which could scarcely be irrespective of the Eucharist? How, again, could he talk of the bread after consecration becoming "a certain holy body,"[4] if he had held it to be the actual Flesh of our Lord? Or how could he be satisfied with saying, "the bread called the Eucharist is a *symbol* of our thanksgiving to God,"[5] if he maintained that the material was not bread, and that the symbol was lost in the corporal reality? Would passages like these have been suffered to remain in a text which had been modified by a Romanist?

Or again, asserting as the Romanist does, the expediency of having prayer in the Church, and administering the Sacraments in *a tongue not understood by the people*, how could he acquiesce in a paragraph such as this? Origen is defending the language of Scripture against Celsus, who describes many of its maxims as not only common to the Greeks, but as having been better expressed by them—"If a Greek desired to assist those who spoke Egyptian or Syrian by sound teaching, he would first take care to learn the dialects of those who were to be his hearers; and, as the Greeks say, would rather barbarize his own tongue for the sake of improving the Egyptians and Syrians, than be a Greek and speak in a manner that

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, I. § 48.
[2] VI. § 70.
[3] VIII. § 21.
[4] § 33.
[5] § 57.

would be useless to Egyptians and Syrians: so, Divine Providence not merely having respect to Greeks of education, but to all others, condescended to the boorishness of the mass of hearers, in order that, making use of such language as they were accustomed to, it might provoke the multitude to listen; who, after this introduction, would be able to advance from the simple element to the comprehension of the deeper meanings which Scripture contained."[1] Again, in another passage still more apposite, Celsus having imputed to the Christians, whom he confounds with some other class of worshippers, a practice of invoking angels by certain barbarous names, and so acquiring favour with them, Origen replies, "Be assured that the Christians do not universally use in their prayers even the names which are found in the Holy Scriptures, and are of God's appointment; but the Greeks use Grecian names, and the Romans Roman names, and thus each prays to God in his own language, and praises him according to his power. And he who is Lord of all languages hears those who pray in all languages, as though he heard, if I may so express myself, only one and the same voice uttering its meanings in many tongues:"[2]—this, surely, a sentiment which the Romanist, had he been shaping the text of Origen to suit the purposes of his own Church, would have thought it as well to suppress.

Again, jealous as the Romanist has shown himself of the *free circulation of the Scriptures*, would he have been likely to suffer so many passages to keep their ground in the writings of Origen, which are entirely adverse to this restriction, if he was moulding those writings to his own ends? Celsus had found in one Cleomedes a person who, like Jesus, was buried and had escaped from the tomb. "But the previous life of this man," replies Origen, "or that of other men respecting whom similar tales are told, gives no tokens of Divinity; whereas the assemblies of those who have derived benefit from him testify to that of Jesus, so do the prophecies spoken concerning Him, so do the cures that have been wrought in his name, and so does the wisdom and knowledge, which are according to Him; and so do the thoughts of the sober-minded, found as they are to rise above a bare belief,

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, VII. § 60. [2] VIII. § 37.

and to investigate the real meaning of the Scriptures, agreeably to the command of Jesus, who said 'Search the Scriptures;' and to the will of Paul, who teaches that 'we ought to know how to give an answer to every one;' and to the will of him who says, 'Be ever ready to give an answer to every one that asketh you a reason for the faith that is in you.'"[1] And he elsewhere enlarges on the happy effects which flow from this study—effects greatly surpassing those which proceed from application to the writings of even the very chief philosophers. Plato, it is true, may speak of a light suddenly kindled in the soul by long communion with the chief good; "but observe the difference between what is said by Plato, and well said, concerning the chief good, and what is said by the prophets concerning the light of the blessed; and consider that the truth on this subject, as spoken by Plato, neither helps ordinary persons nor even one who philosophizes on the chief good after the manner of Plato, to attain to sincere piety. Whereas the simple speech of the Divine Scriptures imparts a kind of inspiration to those who read them unaffectedly; whereby the light is fed with that oil of which the parable speaks in a figure, the oil which kept alive the lamps of the five virgins."[2] It is evident that nothing like reserve in communicating the Scriptures to the people, that is to Christians in general, is here inculcated, but quite the contrary: the expression, "the simple speech of the Scriptures" here used, and that of reading them "unaffectedly," being enough in themselves to mark that Origen contemplated *unlearned* readers of them as well as others; which is still more apparent from another passage (one which again the Romanist would have been under a temptation to expunge) where to a cavil of Celsus, that anger and the like terms ought not to be ascribed to God, as they are in Scripture, Origen replies, that "the word of God *economises* the expressions of Scripture, adapting them to the capacity of the hearers, and measuring what is fit in itself by what is profitable to them. Touching which method of communicating the things pertaining to God, we read in Deuteronomy,[3] 'The Lord thy God bare thee, as a man doth bear his son;' as though the Word spake after the manner of men in accommodation to men, for-

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 33. [2] VI. § 5. [3] Deut. i. 31.

asmuch as the multitude at large (οἱ πολλοὶ) being what they were, did not require God to address them according to the Majesty of his character;"[1] and he then proceeds to say that the Scriptures contained deep things for the spiritual, and more simple things for the weak, and that they would be often found by one who knew how to construe them aright, to speak to both these classes under one and the same phrase. It is obvious that in all this there is none of the spirit of the exclusionist.

And thus I am naturally led to the consideration of a kindred subject, the *Disciplina arcani;* the reserve with which the mysteries of religion should be disclosed; and which we shall gather from numerous passages of Origen amounted to this, and nothing more, a proper adjustment of your teaching to your audience, a care not to throw your pearls before swine. Thus Celsus taunts the Christians with repelling from them wise and thoughtful men, and canvassing only the silly and servile. To this Origen replies, that on the contrary, if there be any capable of receiving the deepest truths, the Gospel makes provision for them; even as Paul says, "Howbeit we speak wisdom among them that are perfect;"[2] and then he continues, "If Celsus with his friends maintains that Paul had no particular wisdom to divulge, we make answer, first explain to us his Epistles, and entering into the meaning of every expression in them, (for instance, in those to the Ephesians, the Colossians, the Thessalonians, the Philippians, the Romans,) satisfy us of both points, viz. that you understand the words of Paul, and that you can prove them to be foolish and weak. For I well know," continues Origen, "that if he devotes himself to reading them with attention," (again observe the layman is invited to this,) "he will either be astonished at the understanding of the man, who conceives mighty thoughts, though he expresses them in homely phrase, or if he does not wonder at him, he will prove himself ridiculous, either by affecting to understand the mind of the man, whilst he did not, or by wishing to contradict and overthrow what he fancied he understood." Origen then proceeds from the case of the Epistles to that of the Gospels, which also have a deep as well as an obvious meaning, "Jesus reserving the full

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, IV. § 71.

[2] 1 Cor. ii. 6.

exposition of his parables for those who had ears more refined than the common, and for his friends in the house." This is a fair specimen of the real nature of the Disciplina arcani, as taught by Origen; indeed, he expressly introduces these as examples of the esoteric and mysterious in the Church of God, indignantly marking the contrast they present to the Egyptian arcana, which Celsus had pretended bore a resemblance to the Christian.[1] Elsewhere Origen furnishes us with more of these "esoteric" speculations, as he calls them, of the more learned Christians, evidently mere theological imaginations, such as men of curious and mercurial minds might indulge in. He is affirming that the Christians, whatever might be their class, would not tolerate, as the heathens did with respect to their local gods, others to be obtruded on them; nor, worshipping as they did the one God and Christ, whom He hath sent, would yet accept Jupiter and Apollo besides; "some (acting thus) in entire simplicity, not knowing how to give a reason for what they did, but content to cleave in an honest heart to what they had received; but others able to give their reasons, and those not trivial ones but profound, or, as a Greek would say, *esoterical* and mystical, involving notions of God and of those who are honoured by God through the Only Begotten Word of God with a share of Divinity, and even with the name, as well as notions of angels, whether good or such as are adverse to the truth," with more to the same effect.[2] The character of the questions in which these more advanced members of the Christian community engaged, serves to prove that the simpler sort were not the victims of any systematic suppression of points of faith by their teachers, but that being of a lower and less cultivated class they were not equal to flights which their superiors allowed themselves. And another passage makes this fact yet more clear. Origen is once more defending the Christians against the imputation of Celsus, that they sought out their converts from among the weak and illiterate; and accordingly he shows how greatly Wisdom is commended in the Old Testament, as in the Psalms

[1] Ἀλλ' αὐτάρκη καὶ ταῦτα πρὸς τὴν ἀφιλόσοφον χλεύην τοῦ Κέλσου, ὁμοιοῦντος τὰ ἔνδον καὶ μυστικὰ τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῖς Αἰγυπτίων αἰλούροις, κ.τ.λ.—Origen, Contra Celsum, III. §§ 20, 21.

[2] Ἕτεροι δὲ μετ' οὐκ εὐκαταφρονήτων λόγων, ἀλλὰ καὶ βαθυτέρων, καὶ, ὡς ἂν εἴποι τὶς Ἕλλην, ἐσωτερικῶν καὶ ἐποπτικῶν, κ.τ.λ.—Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 37.

and in the writings of Solomon, and then coming to the New Testament he proceeds, you no doubt find "the multitude of the believers listening to parables as uninitiated (*ὡς ἔξω τυγχάνοντας,*) and as only capable of exoteric instruction (*ἐξωτερικῶν λόγων*); but you have the disciples learning the exposition of the parables apart, for Jesus explained everything to his disciples apart, honouring those who were destined to be the receptacles of his wisdom above the multitude."[1] But then he subsequently adds, "We, however, exert ourselves to the utmost to have our assemblies consist of intelligent persons; and in that case we do *not scruple to produce publicly,* having a number of intelligent hearers about us, *our highest and most divine doctrines;* but we certainly conceal by our silence the deeper things of our faith from such congregations as have need of what is figuratively called 'milk.' For our Paul writes to the Corinthians—Greeks, to be sure, but not as yet clear of their old customs—'I have fed you with milk and not with meat, for hitherto ye were not able to bear it.' And the same Apostle, knowing what is the more perfect good of the soul, and that the instruction of novices may be compared to the milk which children eat, says, 'Ye are become such as have need of milk and not of strong meat,' &c. Is it possible, then, for those who regard these passages as well spoken, to *suspect that we should decline communicating the choice things of the Gospel to a congregation of intelligent people;* but, when we meet with children and a mob of mean and senseless men, should produce amongst them our divine and venerable mysteries, and make our boast of them amongst such parties as these?"[2] It would be very easy to produce many more extracts from Origen to the same purpose, for this happens to be a subject on which he very frequently touches[3];

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 46.

[2] *Ἡμεῖς γὰρ, ὅση δύναμις, πάντα πράττομεν ὑπὲρ τοῦ φρονίμων ἀνδρῶν γενέσθαι τὸν σύλλογον ἡμῶν· καὶ τὰ ἐν ἡμῖν μάλιστα καλὰ καὶ θεῖα τότε τολμῶμεν ἐν τοῖς πρὸς τὸ κοινὸν διαλόγοις φέρειν εἰς μέσον, ὅτ' εὐπορούμεν συνετῶν ἀκροατῶν· ἀποκρύπτομεν δὲ καὶ παρασιωπῶμεν τὰ βαθύτερα, ἐπὰν ἁπλουστέρους θεωρῶμεν τοὺς συνερχομένους καὶ δεομένους λόγων τροπικῶς ὀνομαζομένων γάλα . . . ἆρ' οὖν οἱ τούτοις ὡς καλῶς εἰρημένοις πιστεύοντες ὑπολάβοιεν ἂν τὰ καλὰ τοῦ λόγου, εἰς μὲν φρονίμων ἀνδρῶν σύλλογον οὐκ ἄν ποτε λεχθήσεσθαι, ἔνθα δ' ἂν ὁρῶσι μειράκια, καὶ οἰκοτρίβων ὄχλον καὶ ἀνθρώπων ἀνοήτων ὅμιλον, ἐνταῦθα τὰ θεῖα καὶ σεμνὰ φέρειν εἰς μέσον, καὶ παρὰ τοῖς τοιούτοις περὶ αὐτῶν ἐγκαλλωπίζεσθαι;*—Contra Celsum, III. §§ 52, 53.

[3] See Contra Celsum, V. § 29; VI. §§ 13. 23.

but I think enough has been already advanced to prove that the Disciplina arcani, as understood by Romish writers, that is, a scheme of mutilated teaching, in which some articles of faith are deliberately withheld, and others announced obscurely, has no support from Origen; and that if his manuscripts had been overhauled by unscrupulous champions of the Church of Rome, they would scarcely have left so many places in them, as they have done, still to bear testimony against themselves.

Once more, considering *the use of images*, which the Romanist defends, and which he adopts so liberally in his church and in his chamber, is it to be believed that when he was engaged in clearing the text of Origen of its inconvenient evidence, or interpolating it with such as suited him, he would have permitted numbers of paragraphs to stand untouched, which are clearly opposed to such a licence? Thus in his treatise on Prayer, "He, who is no hypocrite, strips himself of everything which is adventitious and not his own, and studying to satisfy himself in that theatre which is vastly greater than every other of which I have spoken, enters into the chamber of himself; where, besides any other riches he may have deposited in it, he has enclosed for himself a treasury of wisdom and knowledge, and regarding nothing without, and longing for nothing without, and *shutting every door of the senses, that he may not be drawn away by them, and that no image of sensible things may get admission into his mind*, he prays to the Father, who neither abandons, nor fails a correct worshipper such as this, but makes his abode in him, his Only Begotten accompanying him."[1] And in another of his works—"Though buffeted by the world, we have learned not to faint or to forfeit our love of the God of the universe in Jesus Christ. Moreover, we distinctly avow our origin, and the dignity thereof, by no means, as Celsus insinuates, concealing it: seeing that we impress upon our converts in the very first instance, *a contempt for idols and for all images*; and elevating their thoughts from serving the creature instead of God, we lead them up to Him who created all things."[2]

[1] Πᾶσάν τε τὴν θύραν τῶν αἰσθητηρίων ἀποκλείσας, ἵνα μὴ ἕλκηται ὑπὸ τῶν αἰσθήσεων, μηδὲ ἐκείνων ἡ φαντασία τῷ νῷ αὐτοῦ ἐπεισκρίνηται, προσεύχεται, κ.τ.λ.—De Oratione, § 20.

[2] Ἐπὰν καὶ τοῖς πρώτοις εἰσαγομένοις καταφρόνησιν μὲν τῶν εἰδώλων καὶ πάντων τῶν ἀγαλμάτων ἐμποιήσωμεν, κ.τ.λ.—Contra Celsum, III. § 15.

Again: "Besides our faith conspires with the dictates of common sense; as, *e. g.* however perverted custom may have put it into the minds of men, that images are gods, and that objects made of gold, silver, ivory, are worthy of worship, still common sense urges us to believe that perishable matter cannot be God; nor can God be shaped out of senseless blocks, as if they could in any way represent him."[1] Neither can the evasion be pleaded, that Origen did not condemn the use of images as incentives to devotion, but only as objects of worship: for thus he expresses himself on another occasion: "God therefore chose the foolish things of the world—the most simple of the Christians, who lead lives more pure and moderate than most of the philosophers—to confound the wise, who do not blush to converse with senseless things as gods, or images of gods. For who that has any understanding would not laugh at him, who after so many fine philosophical speeches about God or the gods, fixes his eye on their images, and either puts up his prayers to them, or *by means of the sight of them, carries his thoughts up to the ideal Being, to whom, as he pictures to himself, they must needs ascend from the visible and symbolical figure.*"[2] More passages to a similar purport might be quoted from Origen, but let these suffice; for certainly they are enough to show, that if the writings of this Father were submitted to the pruning knife of a Romish critic, it must be confessed that they had a singularly fortunate escape.

Once more: with respect to *marriage*: it cannot be supposed that any class of society whatever was under forced vows of celibacy, when such a paragraph as the following was penned. Origen, in one of his replies to Celsus, finds an argument for the divine character of the Gospel in the courage with which it inspired its converts, and the superior morality it imparted to their lives: and on this latter point he adds, "Some of them animated by a desire of excessive purity, and of rendering their service to God still more holy, do not even

[1] Ἀλλ' ἡ κοινὴ ἔννοια ἀπαιτεῖ ἐννοεῖν, ὅτι Θεὸς οὐδαμῶς ἐστιν ὕλη φθαρτὴ, οὐδὲ τιμᾶται ἐν ἀψύχοις ὕλαις ὑπο ἀνθρώπων μορφούμενος, ὡς κατ' εἰκόνα ἤ τινα σύμβολα ἐκείνου γιγνομέναις.—Contra Celsum, III. § 40.

[2] Τίς γὰρ νοῦν ἔχων οὐ καταγελάσεται τοῦ μετὰ τοὺς τηλικούτους καὶ τοσούτους ἐν φιλοσοφίᾳ περὶ Θεοῦ ἢ θεῶν λόγους ἐνορῶντος τοῖς ἀγάλμασι, καὶ ἤτοι αὐτοῖς ἀναπέμποντος τὴν εὐχὴν, ἢ διὰ τῆς τούτων ὄψεως, ἐφ' ὃν φαντάζεται δεῖν ἀναβαίνειν ἀπὸ βλεπομένου καὶ συμβόλου ὄντος, ἀναφέροντός τε ἐπὶ τὸν νοούμενον;—Contra Celsum, VII. § 44.

marry as the law allows."[1] Suppose such had been the condition of every ecclesiastic, would there have been no intimation of it here? Still more might the same question be asked after reading another of the objections of Celsus and Origen's answer to it: for on the former affirming, that if the Christians are not prepared to do honour to those demons which preside over the affairs of life, they ought to abstain from taking part in those affairs—neither marry, nor have children, but reduce the world to a solitude—Origen observes, "but God has commanded us to marry, seeing that all are not able to receive that which is more excellent, *i.e.* total purity; and having married, to support the children which may be born to us, and not destroy those whom Providence has given us. And this does not interfere with the duty of abstaining from all obedience to demons that occupy the earth. For, armed with the panoply of God, we stand as godly wrestlers against the race of demons that plot our overthrow. And though Celsus by his argument would utterly drive us out of the world, that so our race might become altogether extirpated from the earth, still we shall persist in living according to the laws of God in the precepts of our Creator, by no means content to serve the laws of sin; and *shall marry wives*, if we choose; and take care of the children which are given us of such marriage."[2] Here Origen talks of "God commanding *us* to marry;" "*we* shall marry wives if *we* choose," &c. Is it then to be believed, that if so considerable a body of persons as the Priesthood were prohibited from marriage, Origen, who was one of their number himself, would have afforded us no hint of so important an exception? For it must be remembered, that we must be content with negative evidence on a question of this kind; since, if no such rule obtained in Origen's days, as the celibacy of the Clergy, it would be impossible that passages should be found in him containing direct objections to such a rule.

Once more; on the subject of the *worship of saints and angels*, there is evidence in Origen against the lawfulness of such a practice much too plain to be overlooked by a

[1] "Ὡς τινας αὐτῶν διὰ τὸν ἔρωτα τῆς ὑπερβαλλούσης καθαρότητος, καὶ διὰ τὸ καθαρώτερον θρησκεύειν τὸ θεῖον, μηδὲ τῶν συγκεχωρημένων ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου ἅπτεσθαι ἀφροδισίων.—Contra Celsum, I. § 26.

[2] VIII. §§ 55, 56.

Romanist, who was reducing his writings to the standard of his own Church. It is true, that in one place where he is distinguishing different kinds of prayer, he says, "It is not improper to offer supplication (δέησιν), intercession (ἔντευξιν), and thanksgiving (εὐχαριστίαν) to saints: and two of these, I mean intercession and thanksgiving, not only to saints, but to ordinary men; but supplication to saints only—*if any Peter or Paul can be found*—that they may help us; making us worthy to enjoy the licence granted to them of forgiving sins" (*i.e.* I apprehend, as Priests do, by absolution): "nay, although a man be not a saint, still if we do him an injury, it is lawful for us, on being made sensible of our offence towards him, to pray (δεηθῆναι) even such a man, that he would forgive us who have injured him."[1] It may be doubted whether Origen in this passage had in his eye any but living saints, to whom supplication was to be addressed; the parenthesis, "if any Peter or Paul can be found," seeming to point to such limit: at the same time, I am disposed to think from other parts of this same tract, that abstractedly he does contemplate the lawfulness of asking for the good offices of saints who are dead; but only in the same sense as the request might have been made to them when alive. It may be, that in these doctrines there proved to be the seeds of an abuse: but Origen could not foresee that: certainly the abuse itself, as it afterwards discovered itself in the practice of the Church of Rome, he would have denounced, as some passages in his works, which I shall now proceed to cite, clearly testify—"Let us next see," says Origen, "how this all-knowing Celsus slanders the Jews; affirming, as he does, that they worship angels, and apply themselves to magic, in which Moses first instructed them. Now where in the writings of Moses," he continues, "did he find him teaching that we ought to worship angels?"[2] —a paragraph utterly inconsistent with the practice of angel-worship in the Church in Origen's time. But decisive as this is, I can bring another yet more so. For to an inquiry of Celsus, what the notion of the Christians might be with respect to angels, whether they were gods or beings of some other

[1] De Oratione, § 14.

[2] Ἰδωμεν δὲ τίνα τρόπον συκοφαντεῖ Ἰουδαίους ὁ πάντ' ἐπαγγελλόμενος εἰδέναι Κέλσος, λέγων αὐτοὺς σέβειν ἀγγέλους, καὶ γοητείᾳ προσκεῖσθαι, ἧς ὁ Μωϋσῆς αὐτοῖς γέγονεν ἐξηγητής. ποῦ γὰρ τῶν γραμμάτων Μωϋσέως εὗρε τὸν νομοθέτην παραδιδόντα σέβειν ἀγγελους;—Contra Celsum, I. § 26.

nature, Origen replies, "We say and confess, that they are ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation; that they ascend, taking with them the prayers of mankind, to the purest celestial places, or to the super-celestial, still purer than these, and that they descend again, bringing down to every one the benefit which God ordains should be ministered to mankind by their hands. These we learn to call angels (messengers) from their employment; and on account of their being divine we find them called in Scripture gods; but not in such a sense *as that we are commanded to reverence and worship them in God's stead*, being ministers unto us, and bearing to us matters of God. For every supplication, and prayer, and intercession, and thanksgiving, we must send up to God who is over all, through the High Priest, who is above all angels, the living Word and God: we shall offer our supplications also to the Word himself, and our entreaties, and intercessions, and thanksgivings, and our prayers, if we are capable of understanding what is prayer *properly* so called, and what improperly. But to invoke angels, when we have not received a knowledge of them, such knowledge being above the reach of man, is not reasonable. Even supposing, however, a knowledge of them, wonderful and ineffable as it is, to be comprehended by us, this very knowledge, whilst it informs us of their nature and of the purposes for which each of them is ordained, will not allow us to have the audacity to pray to any other being besides God, who is over all, and sufficient for all things, through our Saviour, the Son of God."[1]

[1] Ὁμολογουμένως μὲν γὰρ ἀγγέλους φαμὲν λειτουργικὰ ὄντας πνεύματα, καὶ εἰς διακονίας ἀποστελλόμενα διὰ τοὺς μέλλοντας κληρονομεῖν σωτηρίαν, ἀναβαίνειν μὲν προσαγόντας τὰς τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐντεύξεις, ἐν τοῖς καθαρωτάτοις τοῦ κόσμου χωρίοις ἐπουρανίοις, ἢ καὶ τοῖς τούτων καθαρωτέροις ὑπερουρανίοις, καταβαίνειν δ' ἐκεῖθεν, φέροντας ἑκάστῳ κατ' ἀξίαν τῶν ἀπὸ Θεοῦ τι αὐτοῖς διακονεῖν τοῖς εὐεργετουμένοις προστασσομένων. τούτους δὴ ἀγγέλους ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔργου αὐτῶν μεμαθηκότες καλεῖν, εὑρίσκομεν αὐτοὺς, διὰ τὸ θείους εἶναι, καὶ θεοὺς ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς ποτε ὀνομαζομένους γραφαῖς· ἀλλ' οὐχ ὥστε προστάσσεσθαι ἡμῖν τοὺς διακονοῦντας καὶ φέροντας ἡμῖν τὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ σέβειν καὶ προσκυνεῖν ἀντὶ τοῦ Θεοῦ. πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν, καὶ προσευχὴν, καὶ ἔντευξιν, καὶ εὐχαριστίαν, ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερέως, ἐμψύχου Λόγου καὶ Θεοῦ. δεησόμεθα δὲ καὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ Λόγου, καὶ ἐντευξόμεθα αὐτῷ, καὶ εὐχαριστήσομεν, καὶ προσευξόμεθα δὲ, ἐὰν δυνώμεθα κατακούειν τῆς περὶ προσευχῆς κυριολεξίας καὶ καταχρήσεως. ἀγγέλους γὰρ καλέσαι μὴ ἀναλαβόντας τὴν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπους περὶ αἰτῶν ἐπιστήμην, οὐκ εὔλογον. ἵνα δὲ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν ἡ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμη θαυμάσιός τις οὖσα καὶ ἀπόῤῥητος, καταληφθῇ· αὕτη ἡ ἐπιστήμη, παραστήσασα τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐφ' οἷς εἰσιν ἕκαστοι τεταγμένοι,

I think the doctrine of *Purgatory* would be the only one of the doctrines which are characteristic of the Church of Rome, that would receive countenance from Origen; and even this very little. The passages in him, which bear upon this subject, are many of them obscure, nor is it always easy to determine whether they relate to purgation in this life or a future one; herein, as in other respects, having much in common with the corresponding ones of Clemens Alexandrinus, to which reference has been made already. The fire, however, of which Origen speaks is metaphorical; and consists of the pain inflicted by the consciousness of sins past, which accumulate, till they, as it were, ignite[1]: and it is corrective, so that having done its office it ceases, all being eventually purified and saved[2]; even those, it should seem, who have been so bad as to have sunk in the successive stages of their existence —for such stages Origen contemplates—into actual evil spirits[3]; the devil himself, however, the author of all evil excepted.[4] Meanwhile, the good are exempt from these purgatorial sufferings; the pains of that estate taking no effect on them; the fire finding in them no pabulum on which to feed. And they are removed to Paradise, where having been furnished with suitable instruction and prepared for heaven, instruction which will fit them in a less period or a greater for a higher estate according to their respective purity, they will at length ascend thither and follow Jesus Christ to his dwelling-place.[5] Purgatory, therefore, as thus understood, is equivalent to the doctrine of temporal as opposed to eternal punishment; and whatever it may be, it has not the least appearance of having been introduced into Origen's writings by Romanists, identified with those writings as it is in such various ways, transmitted through other Fathers to him, and derived in the first instance, there can be little doubt, from heathen philosophy.

οὐκ ἐάσει ἄλλῳ θαῤῥεῖν εὔχεσθαι, ἢ τῷ πρὸς πάντα διαρκεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. —Contra Celsum, V. §§ 4, 5.

[1] De Princip. II. c. x. § 4.

[2] III. c. v. § 7.

[3] III. c. vi. § 3.

[4] Quidam eorum, qui libenter contentiones reperiunt, ascribunt nobis et nostræ doctrinæ blasphemiam, super quâ ipsi viderint, quomodo illud audiant: "Neque ebriosi, neque maledici regnum Dei possidebunt;" licet patrem malitiæ et perditionis eorum qui de regno Dei ejicientur, dicant posse salvari, quod ne mente quidem quis captus dicere potest.—Epist. ad Amicos Alexandrinos, vol. i. p. 5, Bened. Ed.

[5] De Princip. II. c. xi. § 6.

It may be remarked, that by far the greater part of the passages which I have quoted as bearing testimony against the peculiar opinions and practices of the Church of Rome, are found in Origen's treatise against Celsus; much the most valuable of all his works; and which probably has commanded at all times many more readers than any other: indeed the integrity in which the original text has reached us, shows that it was a book always appreciated. It was, in fact, perhaps the first regular anti-infidel publication the world saw: indeed, I may say, it is the only one of that character of the early Church, and thus from its nature was sure to excite the curiosity of after ages, of which infidelity was the badge. If, therefore, the Romanists were under a temptation to corrupt any of Origen's writings, it must have been this; it was a very excellent channel through which to disperse their opinions; whilst any evidence which a popular work of this kind might happen to furnish against them, must have been felt to be doubly dangerous; yet we have seen how prolific in such evidence it is.

I have pursued this argument throughout at greater length, and in more ample detail, than I should have otherwise done, because, whilst it serves to qualify Daillé's assertion, that the works of the early Fathers have been dressed by the Romanists, it serves also to show what the sentiments of these Fathers were on some of the leading articles of the Romish Creed; and will accordingly render it unnecessary at a future stage of these Lectures, and when I shall treat of the *interpretation of Scripture*, and the protection which a knowledge of the Fathers affords against warping that interpretation to uncatholic purposes, to deal again with the case of the Romanists, their opinions and practices having been already proved, though by this incidental process, to be at variance with early patristical testimony, and therefore their peculiar understanding of Scripture to be probably erroneous. Such is the internal evidence against Daillé yielded by Origen; and such are some of the grounds for exercising caution in admitting this same Daillé's *vague* and *indefinite* charge of Romish adulteration of the early Fathers.

Indeed, James, the learned keeper of the Bodleian Library, "the most industrious and indefatigable writer against the Papists," says Wood, "that had been educated in Oxford

since the Reformation,"[1] and who had investigated the subject of the corruptions of the Fathers, effected by the Romanists, with infinite pains, adduces no instance of any Father so treated before Cyprian,[2] whose case I will consider presently. And a very good reason why the *early* Fathers should have escaped any taint from that quarter, suggests itself in the simple fact, that those Fathers were very little read or regarded by the Romanists.[3] Hence the few manuscript copies of the Fathers which have come down to us; hence the original texts often almost or altogether lost, and even those of the translations frequently imperfect. For, as Dodwell observes in a passage of his Dissertation on Irenæus, which I have brought to your notice on other occasions, "These men of more modern days took, forsooth, for their rule of orthodoxy the Fathers of the fourth and following centuries, inasmuch as they who lived after the Councils observed with more exactness the language and phraseology of the Councils; the ancient Fathers, who spoke more loosely and with greater simplicity, they were so far from being accustomed to produce as witnesses, that they rather held them in suspicion if they chanced to make use of words foreign to the received language of their favourite centuries. Accordingly Photius often animadverts severely on the most ancient Fathers, and on that account is very properly reproved by our illustrious Bull. And as often as the more modern Councils confirm their decrees by the testimony of the more ancient writers, as their custom is, we constantly, in the Greek Councils, find the names of Athanasius, Basil, both the Gregories, and Chrysostom, but not the names of Clemens Romanus or Alexandrinus, nor of Barnabas, nor of Justin Martyr, Irenæus, Athenagoras, Tatian, Theophilus of Antioch, Dionysius of Corinth or him of Alexandria, Musanus, Miltiades, Melito, Apollinarius of Hierapolis, or of the other Ante-Nicene Fathers, whose names and works Eusebius has made a catalogue of, and after him Jerome. So in the Latin Councils we read of Hilary, and Jerome, and

[1] See p. xvii. of the new edition of James's Treatise of the Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers, by John Edward Cox, 1843. James died, 1629, aged 58.

[2] See p. 75, "The second part, Corruption of the true Fathers. The *first* notorious corruption out of St. Cyprian's De Unitate Ecclesiæ," and p. 104, "The second place corrupted, in the 49th Homily of the Author of the imperfect work upon Matthew."

[3] See quotations from Erasmus in Daillé, p. 80.

Ambrose, of Augustine most of all, and of those later than Augustine; but not of Irenæus, or Tertullian, very rarely of Cyprian, not of Arnobius, Lactantius, Victorinus of Petavio the martyr. Thus it came to pass that the old Ante-Nicene Fathers, being in the first instance neglected and seldom cited, by degrees, in most cases, dropped almost out of sight. For these people were not used to test their decrees (as they ought to have done) by the old Ante-Nicene Fathers, but, on the contrary, indulged themselves in the most harsh censure of the most ancient Fathers, on the strength of modern decrees and established dogmas."[1] And Bishop Bull, you will remember, is as much concerned in defending the authority and orthodoxy of the primitive Fathers against Petavius or Petau, a Jesuit, as against Zuicker, a Socinian, or Sandius, an Arian.[2] And in the Glossa Ordinaria, or running comment on Scripture used in the Romish Church in the middle ages, the references to the Fathers are almost always to those of a later date. And the effect of old habits may be seen even in our Homilies, for whilst in the second book, which came out when the principles of the Reformation had been more examined, the Ante-Nicene Fathers are frequently quoted; in the first book, if I mistake not, there are but two references to Origen, and one to Cyprian, and not one to any other before the Council of Nice.

Of course, I do not contend that the line of argument which I have been pursuing with respect to the corruptions of the Ante-Nicene Fathers is conclusive as to their purity, or can be taken as an answer to any particular cases of adulteration which can be alleged: if such cases can be found, they must stand upon their own merits; but I have urged it as proper to neutralize the effect of those *vague and indefinite insinuations* of interpolation or mutilation cast out against these Fathers by Daillé, and by the Puritan and Calvinistic party generally, by which it is their intention so far to undermine their credit and bring them into general suspicion, as to check all curiosity about them, and divert people from a course of study which would not be favourable on many accounts to the class of opinions they are disposed to support and propagate. The argument I am urging at least goes to

[1] Dissert. in Irenæum, V. pp. 408, 409.
[2] Life of Bishop Bull, pp. 243–246. | 258, Oxf. Ed. and Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 2. c. iv. § 9, and sect. 3. c. v.

show this, that the *general* aspect of the writings of these earliest Fathers does not bear token of having been submitted to the revision of *Romish* authorities, or of having taken material harm at any rate from *Romish* custody—what damage there was being incurred rather from neglect than from interference. Even if the Romanists had been restrained by no scruples from debasing the manuscripts, they were in a great measure saved from the temptation by their ignorance of their contents.

The particular case of fraud which Daillé adduces (for in this instance he is precise[1]), as attempted to be practised by the Pope's legate so early as the Council of Chalcedon, in interpolating a canon of the Council of Nice, which he had occasion to quote, does not support the disproportionate conclusions he draws from it. It appears that in citing the sixth canon of the Council of Nice, the legate Paschasinus, instead of reading it *τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη κρατείτω, τὰ ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ καὶ Λιβύῃ καὶ Πενταπόλει, ὥστε τὸν Ἀλεξανδρείας ἐπίσκοπον πάντων τούτων ἔχειν τὴν ἐξουσίαν, ἐπειδὴ καὶ τῷ ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ ἐπισκόπῳ τοῦτο σύνηθές ἐστιν, κ.τ.λ.* "Let the ancient customs prevail; those in Egypt, and in Libya, and in Pentapolis; to wit, that the Bishop of Alexandria have authority over them all, for the same thing is usual at Rome with respect to her Bishop;" it appears, I say, that instead of reading the canon so, he ventured to cite it thus, *ἡ ἐκκλησία Ῥώμης πάντοτε ἔσχε τὰ πρωτεῖα, κ.τ.λ.* "The Church of Rome hath everywhere had the primacy," &c. But it is by no means clear that there was any attempt at fraud in this transaction. The legate was probably meaning merely to give the substance and not the words of the canon, which was to this effect, that as the Bishop of Rome had the primacy everywhere in the province of Rome; so the Bishop of Alexandria should have the primacy throughout his province; in short, that metropolitan Bishops should everywhere have the primacy over their suffragans in their own provinces, the word *πάντοτε* simply meaning everywhere in his own province, not everywhere in the world, which made the case parallel to the one under consideration, as it was intended it should be. Moreover, it seems probable that Paschasinus being a Latin was quoting from an ancient Latin version or free interpretation of the canons of the Council of Nice, and was misled by it, so far

[1] Daillé, p. 71.

as misled he was. And at all events, the correct copy of the canons was produced, and the error, whether wilful or accidental, put to rights, so that if there was artifice in the world, there was vigilance to counteract it too.[1] On the whole, therefore, how inordinate must we consider the conclusion which Daillé draws from this single case of Paschasinus, that "when the legates of the holy Pontiff did not scruple to corrupt so venerable a canon by such ill-treatment as this, we can no longer believe anything to be sound, anything unadulterated, which antiquity hath left us, unless it be what is of no moment, or else what could not be contaminated without the greatest infamy and universal reprobation."[2]

[1] See Routh, Scriptor. Ecclesiasticor. Opusc. tom. i. p. 404.

[2] Daillé, p. 71.

LECTURE VI.

Interpolation of Cyprian in the editions of Manutius and of Pamelius; continued by the Benedictine editors. Purity of earlier editions. No evidence of the corruption of MSS. Limited extent of the remaining corruptions in the edition of Manutius. Mass of evidence in Cyprian against the Romanists; on the Papal Supremacy; on Transubstantiation; on Tradition; on Absolution; on Extreme Unction; on the number of the Sacraments. Germ of abuses discoverable in him; not introduced by the Romanists. Estimate of patristic testimony formed by English Divines since the Reformation. Causes of the outcry against the Fathers raised by Daillé and others.

I SAID that the first of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and indeed the only one, whom the Romanists are *distinctly* charged either by Daillé or by James[1] with abusing by interpolations or omissions, is Cyprian; and I have reserved him for a separate and fuller consideration, because in this instance the accusation is made on specific grounds, and the paragraphs adduced, which are supposed to sustain it. For, as I have remarked, Daillé at least usually indulges in more general declamation on the subject of forgery.

It seems that in the Roman edition of Cyprian printed by Manutius in 1564, there were, for the first time, several words introduced into a passage in the "De Unitate Ecclesiæ" of Cyprian, with a view to support the doctrine of the Supremacy of the Pope: and that in the Antwerp edition of Pamelius in 1568, a few more to the same effect were added: corruptions, we may subjoin, which have been continued in the Benedictine edition, though evidently with the feeling on the part of the editor, that corruptions they are, and that the words in question have no right to the place assigned them in the text.[2] Thus, whereas the genuine Cyprian says, "The

[1] See James's Corruptions of Scripture, Councils and Fathers, Part II. p. 75, and Daillé, p. 83.

[2] See a curious note in italics in p. 545 of the Benedict Ed., giving the reason why they had been restored, though Baluzius, whom in general that edition follows, had expunged them.

Hæc rationum momenta, de quibus Critici judicabunt, Baluzium adduxerant, ut nonnulla ex hoc testimonio expungeret. Sed reposita fuere in textu,

Church was built upon one (super unum)," meaning Peter; the interpolated Cyprian says, "upon him alone (super illum unum)." Whereas the genuine Cyprian says, Christ, "that he might make manifest the principle of unity, ordered it by his authority, that the origin of that same unity should begin from one;" the interpolated Cyprian says, "Christ, that he might make manifest the principle of unity, established one chair (unam cathedram constituit), and ordered it by his authority," &c. Whereas the genuine Cyprian says, "Still what Peter was, the same were the other Apostles also; endowed with the same share of honour and power: but the beginning proceeds from unity, in order that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one; which Church the Holy Spirit in the person of the Lord in the Song of Songs designates to be one, and says," &c.: the interpolated Cyprian says, "but the beginning proceeds from unity. The *Primacy is given to Peter* (*Primatus Petro datur*), in order that the Church of Christ may be shown to be one, *and the chair one* (*et cathedra una*). *And they are all shepherds, but the flock is shown to be one, which was to be fed by all the Apostles with unanimous consent* (*et pastores sunt omnes, sed grex unus ostenditur, qui ab Apostolis omnibus unanimi consensione pascatur*), which Church the Holy Spirit in the person of the Lord," &c. And whereas the genuine Cyprian says, "Whoso strives against and resists the Church, can he trust that he is in the Church?" The interpolated Cyprian says, "Whoso strives against and resists the Church; *whoso deserts the Chair of Peter on which the Church is founded* (qui cathedram Petri, *super quam fundata est ecclesia, deserit*), can he trust that he is in the Church?"[1]

Now, these are, no doubt, wilful interpolations of Cyprian, all of them, mind you, occurring in one and the same passage of the "De Unitate Ecclesiæ," so that no general adulteration of the author is pretended. But the example, if used to support Daillé in his charge of forgery, cuts both ways, hinders more than helps him, since the same evidence, which

propterea quod servata fuerunt in omnibus editionibus, quæ in Galliâ ab annis centum et quinquaginta prodierunt, etiam in Rigaltianâ. Quinetiam necesse fuit in Baluzii notis non pauca mutare, ac plura essent mutata, id si commode fieri potuisset.

[1] Cyprian, De Unitate Ecclesiæ, § iv.

proves this Roman edition of 1564 by Manutius to be interpolated in that particular place, proves also how free from interpolation even this passage had been kept in the custody of the Romanists up to that time. There had been editions of Cyprian printed, one in 1477, two in 1520, one in 1525, and one in 1530; all without these intrusive paragraphs. Indeed, Pamelius himself testifies that he had the use of eight or nine printed copies of Cyprian that were before 1564, which were without them; and nine or ten MSS., but one of which contained them[1]: so that the habit of the middle ages, the ages of Daillé's corruptors, as far as the present case testifies, was to keep the ecclesiastical treasures committed to them safe and unimpaired, indeed often not aware that they had such in possession, however, by accident for the once, it might be violated. Nor indeed was it likely that frauds of this kind would be started to any great extent, so long as the Church had no jealous eyes fixed upon her. It was the stir of the æra of the Reformation, which tempted her to falsify antiquity for her own support, but that age which supplied the temptation to fraud, supplied also light and opportunity for detecting it. Indeed, it must have been no easy matter to corrupt the *manuscripts* of an author (so long as his works only existed in manuscript) for a specific purpose, and to make those manuscripts speak uniformly. They were scattered over Christendom, and copies of these would be multiplied from that manuscript, which was the readiest to be had. Nothing could have been more difficult than to render the errors of all identical. A *translation* might give an universal wrong impression of the original, because all the transcripts of that translation would be alike; and whenever the translation, and that only, was read, it would give the same impression of the author, and that an erroneous one. Rufinus, *e.g.* expressly tells us that he had misrepresented Origen, when he thought it expedient to do so, in his version of the "De Principiis,"[2] and accordingly Rufinus's Origen in the absence of the Greek text is that which is now in circulation. But the heretics, to whom he imputes by *conjecture* the interpolation of these passages, which he thinks objectionable in Origen, and which he therefore takes on himself to alter, would have hardly done

[1] Corruptions, Pt. II. p. 78.

[2] Origen, Prologus Rufini in Libros de Principiis and Præf. Lib. tert. pp. 45. 107, Bened. Ed.

so without a conspiracy to that effect amongst all of their body in Christendom, wherever a manuscript of Origen then was—a thing very improbable in itself. Even mutilation of manuscripts though much more easy than interpolation, is proved to have been very difficult to do effectually; that is to say, in a manner so universal, that all the manuscripts should conspire. Thus the five last chapters of Irenæus, were suppressed in all the editions of Irenæus, which preceded that of Feuardentius, and upon the faith of manuscripts. The extinction of them, however, effected, as is supposed, by those who disapproved of the doctrine of the Millennium, which they advocated, was not so complete, but that Feuardentius found them in his own manuscript, and replaced them, future editors following him; and now they stand as a monument of the impracticability of this kind of fraud.

There is another complaint still made by James against the edition of Manutius—that it omits the 74th and 75th Epistles; the first, one of Cyprian "ad Pompeium contra Epistolam Stephani;" the latter an Epistle of Firmilianus to Cyprian; and both of them taking very great liberties with the Pope. But these are found in all the manuscripts, so that no attempt was made to suppress them in the middle ages; and they were even restored by Pamelius in his edition, which came out four years later than that of Manutius,[1] and are now in the Benedictine edition.

Daillé also notices[2] a wilful omission of the sentence "Et vestram quoque sententiam"[3] in Ep. xi. to the people of Carthage, in Pamelius' edition and in the two editions which had preceded it—these words showing that the people took part in the affairs and deliberations of the Church, together with the clergy; on which account, says Daillé, they were suppressed. But it *was* a suppression, for the words are confessed to have been in the manuscripts, which had therefore been kept pure[4]; and they were restored in subsequent editions, and now are found in the Benedictine. And the same is true of the alteration of "Petrum" for "Petram" made by Pame-

[1] James, Pt. II. p. 87.

[2] Daillé, p. 83.

[3] Audiant, quæso, patienter consilium nostrum; expectent regressionem nostram ut, cum ad vos per Dei misericordiam venerimus, convocati coepiscopi plures, secundum Domini disciplinam et confessorum præsentiam et vestram quoque sententiam, beatorum martyrum literas et desideria examinare possimus. —Cyprian, Ep. xi. § 3.

[4] See Benedict. Ed. p. 398.

lius in the 40th Letter, also noticed by Daillé: it was made against the manuscripts, and has since been corrected by the Romanists themselves.

I do not observe any other charge against the Romanists with respect to their treatment of Cyprian besides these; for as to the last three letters, printed in the Benedictine edition of Cyprian, the editor himself does not pretend that they are genuine—habes fatentem reum—and yet what a temptation must they have been under in dealing with him, to mutilate him, if they knew what was in him! For who can read Cyprian without perceiving the strong testimony he bears against the Romanists in many most vital dogmas, he a Latin Father too, and therefore so much more accessible than a Greek; so that if they spared his writings, whose should they spoil? Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, in the 48th Letter, writes to Cyprian and tells him of the schismatical proceedings of Novatianus, Novatus, and others; and in the 49th, Cyprian replies to Cornelius, approving what he had done, confirming his ill opinion of Novatus by a report of his proceedings at Carthage before he went to Rome, where his attempts to disturb the Church were the same as those he had made at Carthage; "only," adds Cyprian, "as Rome, on account of *its magnitude*, ought to take the lead of Carthage, his achievements there have been worse and more mischievous." Is this the ground on which the modern Church of Rome would have its superiority established? The 55th Letter of Cyprian is addressed to the same Cornelius in terms quite didactic—Cornelius, it should seem, having invited his counsel in a difficulty. Again, his 67th Letter is written to Stephanus, the successor of Cornelius, entirely in the language of an equal, the Gallic Church having appealed for advice to them both as conspicuous Bishops of the Church Catholic, and Cyprian in this letter suggesting what should be done. The 68th Letter is an answer to a similar application for counsel made by the Church of Spain to Cyprian, and not made, you will observe, to the Bishop of Rome. The 74th Letter, addressed to Pompeius, a Bishop of Tripolis, animadverts on a letter of the same Stephanus on the subject of the Baptism of heretics, in terms of high indignation. He bids Pompeius read this letter of Stephanus, which he incloses to him, "and then," says he, "you will mark his error yet more and

more; endeavouring, as he does, to assert the cause of the heretics against the Christians, and against the Church of God. For amongst other things either arrogant, or irrelevant, or inconsistent with himself, which he has incautiously written, he has added this, 'If any one, therefore, of any heresy come to you, let no innovation on tradition be attempted, and let imposition of hands be allowed him on repentance.' Not innovate on tradition," Cyprian then exclaims, "as if he was not the innovator, who forgets the unity of the Church, and usurps the right of imparting his mendacious and pestilent dipping. . . . What obstinacy and presumption is it to prefer human tradition to the Divine will, and not to perceive that God is angry as often as human tradition annuls the Divine precepts; saying, 'Ye have made the commandment of God of none effect for the sake of your tradition.'[1] . . . How, then, hath the gross perverseness of our brother Stephanus gone to that extreme, that he should maintain, that sons may be born to God even by the baptism of Marcion, of Valentinus, of Apelles, and other blasphemers against God the Father; and say, that remission of sins is given in the name of Christ, even by those who blaspheme the Father and Christ the Lord God." Whilst in the Epistle of Firmilianus on the same subject, the 75th, we have language held towards Stephanus as strong as Luther's could have been; "I am greatly indignant at the open and manifest folly of Stephanus." "How diligently hath Stephanus fulfilled these wholesome mandates of the Apostle! What lowliness and meekness doth he observe! For what more meek and lowly than to disagree with so many Bishops throughout the world, breaking the bond of peace with each by vain words of discord!" "Thus is not Stephanus ashamed to patronize heretics against the Church, and by such patronage to divide the brethren; nay, even to call Cyprian a false Christ, a false apostle, a deceitful workman; who, being conscious that he was all these himself, forestalled the charge!" And much more to the same effect. Is this the kind of language which Rome would wish to preserve and circulate? Yet there it is in the manuscripts, which have been for ages in her custody! The manner in which she is disposed to deal with it (for she feels the pungency of it) is by endeavouring to discredit Firmilianus himself; to how little

[1] Matt. xv. 6.

purpose, however, may be seen in Bishop Pearson's defence of Firmilian, which is attached to Mr. Churton's recent Life of Pearson.[1] But this attempt of the Romanists was all fair; if they could succeed in damaging the character of the testimony of Firmilian by argument or historical evidence, well and good. But they did not expunge the letter from the manuscripts. Again, in a letter to Quintus, a Bishop of Mauritania,[2] on the same subject, Cyprian writes, "After all it must not be merely custom, but reason, that must decide the question. For Peter, whom the Lord chose first, and upon whom he built his Church, when Paul afterwards disputed with him on the question of circumcision, did not make *any arrogant claims for himself, and say that he had obtained the Primacy,* and ought to be obeyed by those who were younger and later than himself; neither did he despise Paul, because he had been a persecutor of the Church, but listened to the sound reasons by which Paul maintained his cause." Again, a few schismatics, who had set up a Bishop of their own at Carthage, had sailed to Rome, as we have already seen, and published their proceedings there in the hope of finding support. In the letter which Cyprian writes to Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, to counteract these,[3] and to which I have before had occasion to refer, he asserts principles quite at variance with the pretensions of the modern Church of Rome. "Since it is determined by us all," says he, "and is a thing no more than just and right, that the cause of every one should be heard in the place where his offence has been committed, and that his own portion of the flock should be assigned to each pastor for himself to guide and govern, having by and by himself to render an account of the same to God, it becomes those whom we preside over not to run about and bring Bishops into collision by their temerity, but to plead their cause in the place where they have both their accusers and witnesses, unless it be, that to a few desperate and abandoned men the authority of the Bishops of Africa may seem less, because they have already passed judgment upon them, and condemned by their grave censure those whom their own consciences had condemned already." There is an independence here claimed for separate Churches, which would not suit the Pope of Rome of later times, as

[1] Bp. Pearson's Minor Theological Works, Vol. I. Appendix A. p. civ.

[2] Ep. lxxi.

[3] Ep. lv.

would neither the assertion contained in an address of Cyprian's to the Bishops assembled at Carthage to record their sentiments on heretical Baptism. "None of us holds himself to be a Bishop of Bishops, nor by any tyrannical threats drives his colleagues to the necessity of obedience, inasmuch as every Bishop must exercise his free judgment according to the right of liberty he possesses."[1] I could produce abundance of passages on the Supremacy of the same character from Cyprian, and am only embarrassed by the affluence of my resources.

Again, we find in the 63rd Epistle many expressions altogether inconsistent with their author's belief in *Transubstantiation*. "Christ's Blood *seems* to be in the cup (videtur esse in calice)"—"is represented (ostenditur)"—"water alone cannot possibly *express* the Blood of Christ (quæ sola Christi sanguinem non possit exprimere.)" But as I referred to these passages at some length in the second Lecture, I now only remind you of them. There is another passage, however, to which I did not then advert, to the same purport, in the 76th Epistle. "When the Lord *calls* the bread his Body (vocat), made up as that bread is of many grains, he indicates, that our people, whom he bare, were to be *united;* and when he *calls* the wine his Blood (appellat), made up as that wine is from many berries of the grape, he signifies that our flock is composed of an *united* multitude." The use of such terms is inconsistent with the existence of a belief in Transubstantiation in the mind of Cyprian at the time. Yet remember, all these expressions, from which we draw so important a conclusion, are found in manuscripts preserved for us by the Romanists.

Again, observe the manner in which the question of *Tradition* is treated of by Cyprian. It was touched upon in a former quotation, but it requires to be more distinctly produced: my object, you will bear in mind, being all along to show that the character of the writings of Cyprian, even as we have them at present, is in itself a presumption, that the Romanists cannot have meddled with them to any amount;

[1] Neque enim quisquam nostrûm episcopum se esse episcoporum constituit, aut tyrannico terrore ad obsequendi necessitatem collegas suos adigit, quando habeat omnis episcopus pro licentiâ libertatis et potestatis suæ arbitrium proprium, tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest alterum judicare.—Concil. Carthag. sub Cypriano VII.

and that it is unfair, therefore, to insinuate the charge without some definite evidence of it. Thus, "Whence is this tradition?" says Cyprian, in answer to Stephanus on one occasion, when he had pleaded it against him. "Whence is this tradition? Does it descend from the authority of the Lord and the Gospel, or from the mandates and Epistles of the Apostles? For God testifies that those things are to be done, which are *written*; his language to Joshua being, 'This book of the Law shall not depart from thy mouth, but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do according to all that is *written* therein.'[1] And the same Lord sends his Apostles and commands them to baptize all nations, and to teach them to observe all things whatsoever He hath commanded.[2] If, therefore, it is either taught in the Gospel, or is contained in the Epistles of the Apostles, or in the Acts, that persons coming from whatever heresy are not to be baptized, but are simply to receive imposition of hands as penitents, let this *Divine and holy tradition be observed.* But if they are always named as enemies, and antichrists, as to be avoided and as self-condemned, how can they not be condemned by us?"[3] Again, "Let us, I say, as faithful servants of God, defend the camp, committed to us from above, with trustworthy valour: and let not *custom*, which hath beguiled some, prevail with us against truth. For *custom without truth is merely antiquity of error.*"[4] Once more in the same Epistle, "If a pipe, which supplied water, suddenly failed, should we not go to the fountain-head to know the cause, whether the spring was dry, or whether the failure was between, in the middle—the pipe broken or leaky—in order that this being repaired, the water might be restored to the city, fresh and full? So ought the priests of God to act in keeping the Divine precepts. If the truth is in any particular shaken or damaged, we must revert to the Divine source, to Evangelical and Apostolical tradition, that our conduct may proceed according to the origin it springs from." The terms Evangelical and Apostolical tradition, pointing, it should seem, to the written Gospels and Epistles, to which reference had been made as a standard already in the same letter. In the Council of the 87 Bishops, whose sentiments Cyprian has

[1] Joshua i. 8.
[2] Matt. xxviii. 20.
[3] Ep. lxxiv.
[4] Ibid.

left on record, Libosus of Vaga said, "The Lord in the Gospel declared, 'I am the truth.' He did not say, 'I am custom.' Therefore, when truth is discovered, custom must give place to it."[1] In the same Council, Felix of Bussacenæ said, "Let no one prefer custom to reason and truth in admitting heretics without Baptism into the Church." Further yet, in the Epistle of Firmilianus the Church of Rome is boldly charged with not conforming in all respects itself to tradition; and tradition is again tested by Scripture. "But that the brethren at Rome themselves do not keep primitive tradition in all particulars, and that they pretend to the authority of the Apostles without ground, one may know from this, that with regard to the time of celebrating Easter and many other mysteries of religion, they seem to observe different customs from others, from *the Church of Jerusalem for instance*—and so in very many provinces, many other things differ according to the difference of places and names, and yet there is no departure on this account from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church. Whereas, Stephanus has dared to break that peace with you, which his predecessors have always maintained towards you in mutual love and honour; and has even dared to defame Peter and Paul, the blessed Apostles, as though the *tradition* had come from them, whereas in their *Epistles* they execrate heretics, and warn us to avoid them."

I am not now determining how far Cyprian is judicious in all his remarks on the subject of tradition; or how far the accidental circumstance of the Bishop of Rome being against him on a great question, and pressing him with tradition, which that Bishop maintained was against him too, drove Cyprian, a man of hot temperament, or Firmilianus, who seems to have been of the same, to disparage tradition unduly, and in a manner, which might be made to recoil on themselves; but I venture to claim these passages as conceived in a spirit utterly adverse to the teaching of Rome on this difficult question; and I venture to claim them too as passages, which she would have been likely to expunge from the manuscripts, had she made no conscience at all about the custody of such documents; and had simply used them in whatever way appeared most for the advantage of the Romish Church—unless, indeed, she was ignorant of the contents of Cyprian's works; which is an

[1] Concil. Carthag. sub Cypriano VII.

alternative that answers my purpose equally well; for she could not interpolate what she did not read.

Again, on the subject of *Absolution*, the language of Cyprian is remarkable for its moderation. Thus even Cornelius himself, the Bishop of Rome, writes in a letter found in Cyprian,[1] as follows. "We restored Maximus to his place in the Church, and received the rest, the people greatly approving. But we *left the whole to God, in whose power all things are reserved.*" In another Epistle Cyprian himself, after saying that no absolution was to be had for schismatics,[2] however they might get through the preliminary forms, proceeds, "Who under such circumstances would not resign himself to despair?" and adds, the Church then is not to repel penitents; "and inasmuch as there can be no confession in the grave, penitents must be received into the Church again before they die, and must be reserved in it for the Lord, who, when He shall come to His Church, will himself determine who are they that He finds within it."[3] Nor are we left at a loss to know the rule by which Cyprian imagines the Deity will act on such occasions. For in another place[4] of the same Epistle, he says, "Neither do we prejudice the judgment of God, who if He finds the penitence of the sinner full and satisfactory, will ratify that which we have decreed. But if any one have cheated us by a show of penitence, God who will not be mocked, and who knows the heart, will determine from matters which have escaped our eye, and rectify the decision of his ministers." There are several other passages in Cyprian carefully referring to God as the fountain of all pardon, however he may make his Priests the conditional instruments of conveying it.[5] Would this be the tone in which the Church of Rome would willingly speak on the subject of Absolution? Yet she was the guardian of the manuscripts that put us in possession of the evidence against herself.

With respect to *Purgatory*, Cyprian may here be in some degree wise beyond what is written; but the Church of Rome

[1] Ep. xlvi. § 2.

[2] *I. e.* as long as they continued in schism. Cyprian is arguing against those who objected to the restoration of the lapsed.—Ed.

[3] In Ecclesiam debent interius suscipi et in ipsâ Domino reservari, qui ad Ecclesiam suam venturus de illis utique, quos in eâ intus invenerit, judicabit.—Ep. lii. § 29.

[4] Ep. lii. § 18.

[5] See De Lapsis, §§ xvi. xvii. Testimoniorum, III. c. xxviii.

at any rate would find no plea for the monstrous abuses, which have grown up under her teaching, in the writings of Cyprian at least. He appears to consider that the souls of none are so free from the stain of sin when they die, as to be fit at once to enjoy the presence of God, that the last farthing (an expression which we have seen other of the Fathers apply to the remains of sin, which are to be scoured out of the soul by some discipline even after death) is to be paid by all, however good, except the martyrs; they are excused the rigorous exaction.[1] This premised, we read in him such passages as the following, "Believe then, and live ye: and ye who persecute us for a time, rejoice with us for eternity; when ye depart hence, no place will be left for repentance, no *opportunity for making satisfaction* will remain. *Here* it is, that our life is lost or kept. *Here* we must provide for our eternal salvation by the worship of God, and the fruits of faith. *Whilst we are in the world* no repentance is too late. The way to God's indulgence lies open; and access is easy for those who seek and understand His truth. Do you, even at the very last, when this temporal life is on the point of setting, beg pardon of God for your sins; beseech Him confessing and believing; and pardon is granted you: the Divine compassion is accorded to your faith; and at the point of death a passage is made for you to immortality."[2] And again, "Whatsoever God finds you when he calls you, such will he judge you."[3] And again in the same tract, "Behold then the world is shaking, and bespeaks its downfall, not from age, but from its end being come: and do you not give God thanks, who is removing you from the catastrophe?" "Who, when abroad, and on his return home, does not wish for speed? And for a prosperous wind, that he may the sooner embrace those who are dear to him? Paradise is our country. Why do we not hasten to salute our relations, who are there before us? Numbers of parents, of brothers, of sons? What a joy will it be in common to them and to ourselves, to meet together again!"[4]

Here there may be some difficulty in reconciling the former with the latter statements, though perhaps the assertions of Cyprian, on the whole, may be thought to amount to no more

[1] De Laude Martyrii, § xiii.
[2] Ad Demetrianum, § xxv.
[3] De Mortalitate, § xvii.
[4] §§ xxv. xxvi.

than this, that the fruition of the righteous spirits will not be perfect, though partial fruition there will be for them, till after the judgment, when soul and body shall have been united again, that till then there will be an amari aliquid in ipsis floribus. But however that may be, I only adduce the passages to show that a Romanist, who had to defend his Church on the doctrine of Purgatory, as that doctrine has been practically held by that Church for many years past, would not thank the manuscripts of Cyprian for backing him no better than thus; and that if he knew their contents, and did not meddle with them in order to mend them, it is fair to suppose that it might be his honesty which stood in his way.

Again, the writings of Cyprian seem to furnish evidence, not demonstrative, but all that could be expected under the circumstances, against the practice, much more against the Sacrament, of *Extreme Unction*.[1] At least, I come to such conclusion, from perceiving that on one or two occasions there is no mention made of it, where mention of it might have been expected. Thus, in a letter to the clergy touching the treatment of the lapsed and the catechumens, having observed that there appeared no likelihood of his being able to return to them, and as the summer was coming on, which was a season of sickness, it was necessary that provision should be made respecting the brethren, Cyprian continues, "If any of them shall have received recommendations from the martyrs, and shall find themselves in a dangerous disease, they shall not wait the presence of the Bishop, but after confession made to a Priest, or in his absence to a Deacon, they shall receive imposition of hands from him, and be re-

[1] There is mention made by Irenæus (I. c. xxi. § 5) of a certain party amongst the *heretics*, who communicated their rite of initiation to dying persons by pouring upon their heads a mixture of water and *oil*, in order to prepare their souls for passing invisibly through the spiritual princedoms and powers, that were opposed to them, and escaping their hands; but it is not to be supposed that the Romanists would claim this as their precedent for Extreme Unction.

In Justin Martyr there is a passage where the closing scene of life is touched on without any allusion to Extreme Unction. It is a comment on the 22nd Psalm, applying it in detail to Christ; and when the verses 20 and 21 present themselves, Justin proceeds: "Then his asking that his soul should be saved from the sword, and from the lion's mouth, and from the paw of the dog, was a petition that no one might get the dominion over his soul: in order that we ourselves, when on the point of departing out of life, may make the same request of God, who is able to turn away from us every shameless, every evil angel, that it may not lay hold of our souls."—Dial. § 105.

stored to the Lord in peace."[1] Here the death of the parties is contemplated, and the Pax of the Church is to be communicated to them; yet no allusion is made to the rite of Extreme Unction. And this admission of the sick, before death, to the "Peace" of the Church (a vestige of the custom still remaining in our Service for the Visitation of the Sick, which commences with "Peace be to this house!") is many times referred to in the Epistles of Cyprian, but still without any notice of Extreme Unction. In Ep. xiv. "And when certain of the Lapsed, set themselves to extort by violence 'Peace' from the Martyrs and Confessors, I so far yielded, that if any who had a Martyr's recommendation should be in danger of death, his confession was to be received, hands imposed on him, and he to be restored to the Lord." And in Epistle xxxi., an Epistle which those of his clergy who lived at Rome wrote to Cyprian, we read, "We have thought that nothing new should be done before the appointment of our Bishop: that until such appointment, those of the Lapsed who should be sick unto death, and whose case, therefore, would admit of no delay, on their penitence and tears should be comforted, but with caution, it being left to God to do what He would with such persons, but we on our sides taking care that no over facility should be laid to our own charge." I think that in one or more of these passages it would have been natural that some mention should have been made of Extreme Unction, had that rite been then an established usage of the Church. And in the silence there is with respect to it, I still find an argument in favour of the manuscript of Cyprian not having been medicated by the Romanists.

On the whole, indeed, with regard to the Sacraments, the testimony of Cyprian, so far as it goes, is in favour of two only as generally necessary to salvation, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord. For so much I infer from the following paragraph in the third book "Of the Testimonies against the Jews:" "It is to little purpose to be baptized and to receive the Eucharist, unless we also abound in good works."[2] Why single out these two ordinances as the peculiar means of salva-

[1] Ep. xii.

[2] Parum esse baptizari et Eucharistiam accipere, nisi quis factis et operè proficiat.—Testimoniorum, lib. III. c. xxvi.

tion, to the exclusion of others, unless there was something in them of more than common efficacy; something in them which set them above other rites of the Church, however other rites might also be called in common parlance *Sacramenta* also?—an inference, I observe by the way, seconded by a passage in Justin of a similar import, where, having mentioned the stick (*ξύλον*) which Elisha cast into the river, and so recovered the ax-head, thereby making the sons of the prophets to proceed in building their house, he adds, "in like manner did Christ recover us, when plunged into the depths of sin, by being *crucified on the wood*, and by purifying us through the *water*, and so did he make a house of prayer and adoration"[1]—the two Sacraments of the Eucharist and Baptism here also represented, though indirectly, as the ordinances more especially necessary to salvation. The argument is certainly rather founded on the silence of Cyprian, than on his assertion. But we are not to expect from him a formal declaration that there are two Sacraments (in the sense I suppose), if nobody in his time imagined that there were more. The negative testimony is all that the case admits of. Once more I ask, Is there any symptom of Romish interference with the copies of Cyprian here?

It is true that in Cyprian, as we have found was the fact with other of the Fathers before him, the germ or rudiment of several opinions and practices which eventually became abuses of the Church of Rome, are to be discovered. But it is the germ or rudiment only, and it must be ever remembered in how different a light *we* see these faint beginnings after the abuse has become inveterate and notorious, from that in which they would be regarded whilst they were yet initiative only, and when no such evil consequence could have been anticipated. I discover, for instance, in Cyprian's picture of the Church, the elements of the Nun; I mean in the mention he makes of virgins who had dedicated themselves to Christ, not, however, it should seem by a vow, but rather by a resolution, and conditionally.[2] But when Cyprian applauded such self-denial, could he foresee the excess to which the system of the convent was in process of time to prevail, or the evils that were to flow from it? And would he not probably think he was but

[1] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 86.

[2] Cyprian, Ep. lxii.; De Habitu Virginum, §§ iv. xxii.

speaking in unison with St. Paul, "I say, therefore, to the unmarried and widows, it is good for them if they abide even as I?"[1]

Again, I detect the shadow of coming events in the language which Cyprian, when speaking against premature and reckless absolution, incidentally uses, with respect to the influence of the Martyrs—That "he believes," *e. g.* "that the merits of the martyrs, and the works of the just, may have great power with the Judge; but it must be when the day of judgment comes, and when, after the consummation of all things here, we shall stand before the judgment seat of Christ;"[2] his meaning, perhaps, explained by another passage, where he apostrophizes certain confessors in prison, in substance as follows:—"Happy they who have finished their course, and have gone to their Lord's embrace! But your glory is no less, whilst ye tarry and set others an example. Ye fear not death, but rather desire it. Now is the time, brethren dearly beloved, for you to remember me in your prayers, which must be prevailing, for what can you ask from the goodness of the Lord which you do not deserve to obtain?"[3] —the latter paragraph, I say, seeming to throw light upon the former; and the two taken together to be understood as affirming that the prayers of living martyrs, for the term martyr may be applied to the living, would find such favour in God's sight as would recommend their petitions for others to God, and be found to have done them service at the judgment day. Still, in such language as this, I say, it is possible we may detect the intercession of *departed saints*, as invoked by the later Church of Rome, gradually gaining a footing in the Church.

As again, in the certificates of character or Libelli furnished by the Martyrs to those amongst the Lapsed, whose welfare they felt interested in, certificates which were honoured in the Church, and which admitted the bearers of them again into communion with the Church,[4] I can imagine I recognise traces of the Indulgences of Papal Rome; more especially as these Libelli themselves were greatly abused, insomuch that Cyprian has to lay the issue of them under regulations[5]; common

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 8.
[2] De Lapsis, § xvii.
[3] Ep. xv.
[4] Ep. x. Ep. xiv.
[5] Ep. x.

friends of the Martyrs and the Lapsed inducing the Martyrs to give certificates on the faith of their recommendation to persons with whom they were themselves unacquainted, and in whose character they were often grossly deceived, and if I understand a particular expression rightly these dishonest go-betweens, in some instances, making a sale of their services. "But this may be brought about if you regulate those requests which are made to you by religious considerations, taking care to understand and repress those who, having a respect to persons, either pay compliments by means of your favours, or make a pecuniary profit by means of this unlawful negotiation of theirs."[1] The sanction given to these Libelli by the Church, might or might not be indiscreet even at the time, though we must consider of what importance it was to the Church that her Martyrs in those days should be treated with the highest honour—persecution warring against the Church, and bent on extirpating it—we must remember how much the propagation of the true faith depended on the steadfastness of the confessor, and how reasonable, therefore, it was to brace him up to his arduous conflict by every subordinate motive which might weigh with him. But however that may be, it would be hard indeed to visit the Primitive Church with our condemnation for allowing these Libelli (putting them, too, under restrictions), because *we* happen to know, what it was impossible she should, that they might be stepping-stones to Papal Indulgences.

I say that in Cyprian we may discover such foretastes of future opinions and practices of the Church of Rome, as these are examples of; but they are surely not of a character to imply that his writings have been tampered with by Romanists. The Romanists would not have been likely to content themselve with representing questionable features of their Church in the distance, so very faintly as this, or have made no other use of antiquity to sanction their abuses, than this inadequate one. Take them all as the faithful picture of Cyprian's own times, and everything falls into its right place; they become usages very likely to prevail under the circumstances of the Church at that period, and such as might be supposed to grow

[1] Hoc autem totum potest fieri, si ea quæ a vobis petuntur religiosâ contemplatione moderemini, intelligentes et comprimentes eos, qui, personas accipientes, in beneficiis vestris aut gratificantur, aut illicitæ negotiationis nundinas aucupantur.—Ep. x. § 3.

no less naturally in the course of subsequent generations into the malpractices that succeeded. This theory, which is the obvious one, renders all recourse to Papal interpolation as needless, as such provision is inadequate to explain all the particulars of the case.

In all that I have been saying in this and the two last Lectures, my immediate object has been to show from internal evidence, on a general survey of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, that when Daillé and others would disparage *these* Fathers at least —for I predicate nothing with respect to such as are of a later date—by charging them in the mass as alloyed by Romish interpolations, and, consequently, as unworthy of our trust, they are not dealing fairly by them; nor yet by those persons, who, but for the false impression of them they have thus received, might have been disposed to read them and judge for themselves of their merits. But, for argument's sake, let these Fathers be as full of Romish interpolations and corruptions as you please, they still do bear, as you have seen, very strong testimony to very many capital points in favour of the practice and doctrine of the Church of England, and against those of the Church of Rome. Take them as they are, with all their reputed imperfections on their heads, and still this is true of them; and the more you insist on their imperfections, the more you make that testimony tell: since, if carrying so much weight, as you say they do, they still run for the Reformers, what would they do, if they were not weighted at all?

Surely this must have been the impression on Jewel's mind, when he ventured on his famous challenge—and the impression on the minds of the Non-jurors, when they, as I believe they did, renewed it—and the impression on Archbishop Wake's, when he translated and put into circulation several of their writings—and on Archbishop Potter's, when he edited one of them—and the impression of both the one and the other, when by their influence and example, they directed, as no doubt they did, that attention to these writers at Oxford, which caused several of them to be put forth from the press of that University —and the impression of Bishop Pearson, Bishop Bull, and Bishop Beveridge, when they respectively defended and made such liberal use of them—and of Dr. Waterland, when he drew so many of the weapons of his warfare from the same armoury. These men did not think they were abetting the

cause of Rome, when they were thus bringing into notice the works of the Primitive Fathers; but, on the contrary, fancied that they were opposing it in a manner the most legitimate, and the most likely in the long run to be successful. And it would not be a thing which the Church of England would have to lament, if she had these divines for her living champions now, in the room of many others who undertake her defence on other principles.

Neither can I persuade myself to believe that the outcry against these Fathers, raised by Daillé and the foreign Churches, and joined in by Dissenting communities at home so loudly since, and to this day, is altogether prompted by apprehensions of Rome, however it may be convenient to make that the pretext. I suspect that this jealousy of them arises from the opposition they evidently offer to the latitudinarian notions on religious matters which have established themselves both abroad and in this country since the Reformation, through causes which I enumerated in my first Lecture, and which notions had not occupied the minds of the Reformers themselves. How can Non-episcopalians or Anti-episcopalians bear such phraseology with patience as *χωρὶς τούτων*, i. e. Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, *ἐκκλησία οὐ καλεῖται*[1]—and observe them representing, as a matter of course, secession from the Episcopal Church as heresy and schism[2]? How can they do more than pity the pains they take to trace the succession of the Bishops in the Churches up to the Apostles themselves, and the stress they lay upon the continuity being unbroken[3]? How can the various sects with which the country abounds lend their countenance to writers, in whom are found such passages as the following, passages which, if they do not reflect upon their own practices throughout, they must feel do so in many particulars. "In the first place, it is a matter of uncertainty who is a catechumen, who a believer; they as-

[1] Ignatius, Ad Trallianos, § iii., quoted by Bishop Pearson on the Creed. Article ix.

[2] Unde scire debes episcopum in ecclesiâ esse et ecclesiam in episcopo, et si quis cum episcopo non sit, in ecclesiâ non esse; et frustra sibi blandiri eos qui pacem cum sacerdotibus Dei non habentes obrepunt et latenter apud quosdam communicare se credunt, quando ecclesia, quæ catholica et una est, scissa non sit neque divisa.—Cyprian, Ep. lxix. § 8.

Novatianus in ecclesiâ non est, nec episcopus computari potest, qui evangelicâ et apostolicâ traditione contemptâ, nemini succedens a se ipso ortus est.—Ep. lxxvi. § 3, et alibi.

[3] See Irenæus, III. c. iii.

semble alike, hear alike, pray alike—heathens with them, if such chance to come in. They throw what is holy to the dogs, and give their pearls, though not real ones, to the swine. They call that simplicity, which is, in fact, the prostration of discipline; and our concern for it, pandering. They are for peace everywhere, with everybody; for they care not what differences there may be among themselves, provided they co-operate for the destruction of the one simple truth."[1] "The Catechumens are perfect before they are taught. The very women are heretics; and how saucy are they! how bold are they to teach, to contend, to exorcize, to make promises of healing, perhaps even to baptize. Then the ordinations of these heretics are rash, light, inconstant. Now they appoint neophytes; now persons employed in secular affairs; now apostates from us, in order that they may hold them by the love of distinction; seeing that they cannot by truth. Nowhere is promotion more easy than in the camp of the rebels; for to be found there is enough to secure advancement. Accordingly, one is Bishop to-day; another, to-morrow: he is to-day a Deacon, who is to-morrow a reader: to-day, a Presbyter, who is to-morrow a layman (laicus); for they assign priestly offices even to laymen.[2] And what shall I say touching the ministration of the Word? their object being not to convert the heathen, but to subvert us."[3] Is not a sentence like this enough to condemn the author of it in the eyes of multitudes of persons in this country, letting alone the question of Popery, which is the side more convenient to attack him on? And the whole tract "De Præscriptione Hæreticorum," one of the most valuable of his works, is written in a spirit like this. What quarter could Tertullian expect with such a vein in him as we have here? How should those who are not impressed with the great dignity of Baptism be satisfied with those who call it the laver in which we are regenerated[4]; the ordinance by which, through the Spirit, there is regeneration to God[5]; the

[1] Simplicitatem volunt esse prostrationem disciplinæ, cujus penes nos curam lenocinium vocant. Pacem quoque passim cum omnibus miscent: nihil enim interest illis, licet diversa tractantibus, dum ad unius veritatis expugnationem conspirent. — Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xli.

[2] Nam et laicis sacerdotalia munera injungunt.—Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xli.

[3] Cum hoc sit negotium illis, non ethnicos convertendi, sed nostros evertendi.—c. xlii.

[4] Justin Martyr. Apolog. I. §§ 61, 62.

[5] Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 1.

bath which cleanses away the filth of the soul[1]; that, by which the likeness of him who was first formed after the image of God is restored[2]; that by which sin, whether original or actual, is removed[3]; and who describe it in numberless other phrases, which I may produce hereafter when the question of Baptism comes before us, all calculated to enhance the importance of this great mystery? Or how shall those who regard the Eucharist as no more than a commemorative supper, be content to give currency to the opinions of those who speak of it as an ordinance consisting of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly[4]; as in some sense or other an oblation, perhaps such in the unconsecrated elements, perhaps such in the representation of the Passion, or perhaps such in both[5]; or again, who love to enlarge upon it as the Communion of the Body of the Lord, the Communion of his Blood[6]; as that which having received the Logos of God[7] imparts it to the soul, and, through it, immortalizes the body, with more to a like effect, which may be examined on a future occasion? How can those whose theology inclines them to depress the virtue of the Sacraments as the appointed means of grace, look with favour upon authors who exalt those Sacraments so emphatically? Or how, again, can those, who either reject our Book of Common Prayer, or partially assert it, or consent to bracket it, regard with any other feelings than those of distaste primitive writers, who bear witness both to the general style of it, as well as to the early observance of Saints' Days[8]; of Daily Prayers in the Congregation[9]; of Fasts[10]; of an Offertory[11]; and much more? How very few of our newspapers, by which our theology is now a good deal regulated, would approve of any part of this evidence; or have any opinion of men who had left such matters on record!

I have drawn your attention to this feature in the writings of the early Fathers, in order that you may give them fair play. They are to be read with caution, no doubt; and there are not many books of which you may not say the same with

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. ix. p. 282.
[2] Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. v.
[3] Cyprian, Ep. lix.
[4] Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 5.
[5] IV. c. xvii. § 5; c. xviii. § 2.
[6] V. c. ii. § 2.
[7] § 3.
[8] Cyprian, Epp. xxxiv. xxxvii.
[9] Epp. xxiv. xxxiv.
[10] Tertullian, De Jejuniis, c. xiii.; Clem. Alex. Stromat. VII. § xii. p. 877.
[11] Ibid.

truth. But do not take for granted, that all who accuse them of ministering to Popery, are set against them for that reason; for they may be set against them for ministering to many other things far better than Popery. And whilst you use all diligence to detect any interpolations, corruptions, or omissions, by which they have been abused, and express natural indignation against the instruments of such frauds, be they who they may, do not conclude simply because Daillé may tell you so, or anybody else, that there is nothing left in them which can be received with confidence; but use your own sense, and be honest enough, and industrious enough, to discriminate.

LECTURE VII.

The Fathers objected to by Daillé on account of their obscurity. Value of incidental evidence. Clear testimony of Justin and of Tertullian on the Arian question, and on the Eucharist. Charge of *wilful* obscurity. Occasional reserve accounted for. Frank exposition of the Christian Ritual in the Apologies. Reserve of Clemens Alexandrinus. Plan of his writings; and motive of it. Difficulty of Tertullian. Method of studying him recommended. Testimony of the Fathers to principles distasteful to Daillé. Further objection to their style on account of the change which has taken place in the meaning of words. Corresponding changes in things to be tested by comparison with the Primitive Church. Result of that comparison.

IN the last three Lectures we have seen Daillé contending against the value of the Fathers on the ground of the corruption of their writings. He now opens another battery against them, and argues, that even supposing you have satisfied yourself as to which of these writings are genuine, a further difficulty awaits you in their obscurity. So obscure are they, from various causes, that it is next to impossible to extract from them any meaning which shall suffice to affect or settle modern controversies.[1] And before he proceeds to enumerate the causes of their obscurity, he furnishes us with another instance similar to those I have already produced, of the determined spirit of exaggeration which animates him whilst engaged in this anti-patristic warfare. For fetching a compass he actually sets out with impressing on the minds of his readers the necessity of an accurate knowledge of Greek and Latin in order to understand the Fathers, and gives needlessly, one might think, several examples in the Latin versions of some of those written in the former language, which we possess, both ancient and modern, of the mistakes which have been made from the want of that kind of learning. But this is not all, for he then goes on to enlarge upon the difficulty of mastering those languages. "Who does not know," says he, "what pains it takes to acquire an intimate acquaintance with those two tongues? not only what assiduity, but what powers

[1] Daillé, pp. 120, 121.

of mind are necessary to get possession of them? a tenacious memory, a clear head, unwearied study, ready apprehension, daily and diligent reading, and other qualifications of the same kind, which are but rarely met with?"[1] And all this to prove the obscurity of the Fathers! As if it did not tell equally against all authors whatever, who have written in Greek or Latin! But here, as elsewhere, Daillé likes to launch his subject, as he thinks, to advantage; and holds it politic not to proceed to his arguments till he has created a gentle prejudice against the quarter he is about to assail. The real effect, however, of his tactics surely ought to be, to put us on our guard against the man who adopts them, and who discloses at the very outset the animus, not of a truth-seeker, but of a partisan.

The first of the causes of this obscurity in the Fathers of which he complains is, that they wrote before the controversies with which we are concerned had any existence, and consequently that they could not have written with any reference to them; nay, that the controversies, in which they were themselves actively engaged, would rather have the effect of leading their minds away from ours.[2] Thus, that all that can be gathered from the Fathers who lived before the Arian question was agitated, on that subject, is incidental, and accordingly beset with darkness—a darkness similar to that which involves their testimony, when applied to the religious disputations of our times.[3] But it is this very circumstance, the incidental nature of their evidence, that gives it the value it possesses. Suppose, for illustration's sake, a boundary cause was brought into court, and an ancient witness, who knew nothing whatever of the litigation, or the parties to it, deposed to facts within his own knowledge, which were found incidentally to bear on the case, would not such testimony, however incomplete it might be, weigh with the jury infinitely more than the most perfect tale that could be told by any man that was behind the scenes, who was mixed up with the parties and the proceedings, and had taken a side? Daillé's allusion to the Arian question seems unfortunate: for though expressions which might now be considered incautious with respect to the nature of the Son, are certainly to be met with in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, one or two of which he produces from Justin and Tertullian, yet it seems to me impossible for per-

[1] Daillé, p. 130. [2] p. 133. [3] p. 134.

sons of plain understanding to read these Fathers, and not be satisfied that the whole stream of evidence which they present goes to establish the fact, that they had no doubt about the Godhead of the Son; and that though they might not use the very term *συναΐδιος*, they did believe Him to be co-eternal with the Father; and though they did not use the very term *ὁμοούσιος*, they did believe Him to be consubstantial with the Father; and that when such incorrect expressions as those I have referred to happen to drop from them, they may be accounted for most satisfactorily, by the inartificial state of theological controversy at that time; the want of those technical terms in which the polemics of later days learned to express themselves, after Councils had tutored them, and successive heresies had rendered the use of an exact nomenclature in dealing with them necessary.

It is inconvenient to enter into many details in proof of this at present, but I state the fixed impression on my own mind; and take which of the Ante-Nicene Fathers you will, the result, I am persuaded, will be what I say. Daillé, for instance, happens to refer to Justin and Tertullian. What if Justin does press the Jew with the argument that "the God who appeared to Moses and the Patriarchs was the Son and not the Father, inasmuch as the Father did not change place, or ascend, or descend."[1] Or, again, that "No one ever saw the Father and ineffable Lord of all things and of Christ himself; but only saw Him, who according to his will is God, his Son and Angel from ministering to his purposes,"[2] which are the passages Daillé adduces, and to which I could easily add a few others of the same character. They are the unguarded expressions, I repeat, of a man who wrote before the Arian controversy arose: for, with respect to the co-eternity of the Son, I find Justin speaking of his being "inseparable from God in power,"[3] as though the connection was of a kind that was necessary, and must, therefore, have subsisted from everlasting: of his being his only Son *ἰδίως*,[4] *κυρίως*,[5] peculiarly, properly: of his being co-existent with Him, and begotten of Him before all creatures[6]; of his being Wisdom, mentioned in the 8th

[1] Daillé, p. 134. He refers to Justin Martyr. Dial. § 60. § 127.
[2] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 127.
[3] *Ἀχώριστος δυνάμει.*—Cohort. § 38.
[4] Apolog. I. § 23.
[5] II. § 6.
[6] *Πρὸ τῶν ποιημάτων καὶ συν-ὼν καὶ γεννώμενος.*—Apolog. II. § 6.

Chapter of Proverbs,[1] of whom it is said, I was set up from everlasting[2]: of his being the Person whom the Father addressed as another self, when He exclaimed "Let *us* make man:"[3] of his being "the Lord" of the Old Testament, where the Hebrew term answering to it is "Jehovah," the self-existent; as where we read, "The Lord[4] said, Shall I hide from Abraham that thing which I do"[5]; or where we read, "The Lord rained fire from the Lord:"[6] of his being the Person who spake to Moses in the bush, and appropriated to himself the name "I am that I am,"[7] the necessarily existent, and therefore the existent from all eternity to all eternity. And with respect to the consubstantiality of the Son, I perceive Justin representing him as having been in intimate union with the Father from everlasting till projected[8] by Him for the economy of the universe: this process illustrated by the imperfect figure of a *word* emitted by us in conversation being a part of speech within us, and not detracting from the latter, so as to leave us speechless[9]; and the more complete analogy of one fire lighted from another fire, without detriment or diminution of that from which it proceeded[10]—this second illustration one which Justin advances more than once—his reasoning, be it remembered, not directed to prove the consubstantiality of the Son and the Father, but to meet the objection that the substance of the Father must needs be reduced by the severance of the Son, *i. e.* on the supposition that the Son is numerically different from the Father, which is Justin's sentiment; the consubstantiality of the two Persons, therefore, being all the while *presumed* to be indisputable.[11] Why, then, cavil about an inadvertent word in an unscholastic age, when you have the coeternity and consubstantiality clearly affirmed in plain and intelligible language, if not in formal terms, on which two propositions the whole Arian question turns?

Again, what if Tertullian talks of the Son being projected by the Father, and "the Father being the whole substance, the Son a derivation and portion of the whole,"[12] which is another of the objectionable passages which Daillé produces—a passage, however, which may be considered neutralised by an-

[1] Prov. viii. 23. [2] Dial. § 129. [3] § 62.
[4] Ὃς ἦν καὶ ἔστιν.—§ 126.
[5] Gen. xviii. 17.
[6] Gen. xix. 24; Dial. § 60.
[7] Dial. § 60.
[8] Προβληθὲν ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς γέννημα.—§ 62.
[9] Dial. § 61. [10] Ibid.
[11] § 128.
[12] Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. ix.

other in the same treatise, that "though the Son was projected, he was not separated from the Father;"[1] and what if others of the same unguarded kind may be found in him—which I do not deny—still try him by the general and prevailing character of his language on the subject of the Divinity of the Son; and it will be plain, that however inaccurate he might occasionally be in the use of terms, as men of after ages counted inaccuracy, he did himself hold beyond all doubt or dispute, the perfect Godhead of the Son. He calls the Son over and over again *God*[2]; yet says that nothing which had a beginning can be God[3]; says, therefore, that the Son must have been from everlasting; asserts, indeed, directly that God never was alone, having had the Logos in Him from the first[4]; that the Son was called God because He was of the same substance with God[5]; whilst he elsewhere affirms that what is consubstantial with another is co-equal with it[6]; that He is God of God[7]; that the Son is a new name of the Father[8]—the expression precarious, but most emphatic for my purpose; that He is the Person of God[9]; that the Son is not inferior to the Father.[10] And many other passages I could produce sufficiently expounding the mind of Tertullian on this great question; but these, I think, may suffice to show that however the Arians might flatter themselves they had caught Tertullian tripping in a phrase (he, like his brethren, not accustomed to speak by the card), the whole spirit and character of his teaching is thoroughly against them.

I shall content myself at present with thus suggesting these very few facts to show that the testimony of the Fathers, whatever Daillé may say to the contrary, is available against

[1] Prolatum dicimus Filium a Patre, sed non separatum.—Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. viii.

[2] Hunc ex Deo prolatum didicimus, et prolatione generatum, et idcirco Filium Dei, et Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ.—Apolog. c. xxi. Homo etsi Deus. De Resurrectione Carnis, c. li. See also De Patientiâ, c. xiii. and Adversus Marcionem, II. c. xxvii.

[3] Ad Nationes, II. § 3.

[4] Adv. Praxeam, c. v.

[5] Deum dictum ex unitate substantiæ.—Apol. c. xxi.

[6] Adv. Hermogenem, c. xii. Quis non hanc potius (sc. sophiam) omnium fontem et originem commendet, materiam vero materiarum, non sibi subditam, non statu diversam, non motu inquietam, non habitu informem, sed insitam et propriam et compositam et decoram, quali Deus potuit eguisse, sui magis quam alieni egens?—Adv. Hermogenem, c. xviii.

[7] De Deo Deus.—Apol. c. xxi.

[8] Jam enim Filius novum Patris nomen est.—De Oratione, c. iii.

[9] Persona autem Dei Christus Dominus.—Adv. Marcion. V. c. xi.

[10] Non minori se tradidit omnia Filio Creator.—IV. c. xxv.

the Arian, even of the Fathers who lived before the Arian question was stirred, but I shall reserve the fuller development of this subject till I come to treat of the general influence which the primitive Fathers ought to have on our exposition of Scripture. Meanwhile I have taken the two cases of Justin and Tertullian rather than others of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, simply because they are the cases Daillé himself chooses to select,[1] or else others would have answered my end equally well, and from others I could have brought equally strong testimony to prove—not that they understood the language of the schools on this question, for they none of them did, but that they held the orthodox faith, and in language of their own meant to avow it.

In like manner, then, with regard to subjects of more modern controversy—(the nature of the Eucharist is the one which Daillé here touches on)—we may use the testimony of the Fathers, though not delivered with all the exactness employed by more recent disputants—not the less valuable, however, for being inartificial, but the more so—the impressions of men who lived before human ingenuity had been applied to splitting hairs in theology, and who spake as they believed themselves to have been taught by Christ and his Apostles in the sincerity and simplicity of their hearts. The particulars of that testimony on the question of the Eucharist I shall also defer, foreseeing a better opportunity of entering at large into it hereafter. The character of it you will sufficiently remember from the little which I said of it in my last Lecture to make it no matter of surprise to you that Daillé having the bias of a foreign Protestant upon him, should depreciate the authority of the Fathers, and magnify the difficulty of getting at their sense.[2]

The next cause of the obscurity of the Fathers, which Daillé alleges, is not accidental but *wilful*; a studious intention on their part to conceal or only half discover their meaning.[3] They did not think it expedient to disclose to ordinary hearers or readers the mysteries of the faith they professed, and especially the Sacraments of the Church. My business, I beg to remind you once more, is with the *primitive* Fathers; and whatever veil those of later ages may have been disposed to throw over these subjects, the *primitive* Fathers (Origen I

[1] Daillé, p. 134. [2] p. 135. [3] p. 137.

have already handled in reference to this subject[1]) are free from any such disposition, beyond what common sense and a due regard to time and circumstance dictated. They were certainly not inclined to cast their pearls before swine, that would turn again and rend them :—this very text is used by them in self-defence[2] on this very point. It was not likely, it was not reasonable, that they should feel themselves called upon to unfold all the arcana of the Gospel either to those (which was one very large class of heathen with whom they had to deal) who, like Theophilus' friend Autolycus, were so absorbed in their own books, and so wholly devoted to the study of profane authors, that they would not give themselves the least pains to investigate the pretensions of the Gospel, or trouble their heads about the matter,[3] treating the Christians with the most frigid indifference; nor yet to those, which was a larger class still, who scoffed at them as the dregs of the people[4]—as made up of ignorant and credulous women[5]— as worshippers of the head of an ass, and of other symbols still more offensive[6]—subjecting them to the most heartless derision; nor yet to those who only sought such knowledge in order to take advantage of it, and to denounce them hereafter to an unfriendly magistrate.[7] To such persons they might well be reserved, but where there was a fair opportunity afforded them for speaking out, they did not refrain from so doing. Witness the language of Justin Martyr to the Emperors in his Apologies: pleading before such a tribunal he seems to hope that his words may not be altogether wasted, and so far from being mysterious about the ways of the Christians, he is frank and communicative. Those Emperors may have heard the nature of their assemblies and their rites misconstrued and calumniated, he therefore tells them in much detail of all the proceedings of the Christians on those occasions; what books were read; what was the character of the sermons heard; what the nature of the prayers put up; even entering into some of the petitions; in what attitude they were offered; in what portion of the Service the minister was accompanied by the people, in what he officiated alone; what were their

[1] Lect. V.
[2] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § xii.
[3] Theophilus ad Autolycum, III. § 4.
[4] Minucius Felix, c. v.
[5] c. viii.
[6] c. ix.
[7] Tertull. ad Uxor. II. c. v. *et seq.* See also "Reply to the Travels of an Irish Gentleman, &c., by Philalethes Cantabrigiensis," pp. 95, 96.

Sacraments; what was the mode of administering the Sacrament of Baptism[1]; what promises they made at it; what benefits they believed themselves to receive by it[2]; what was the Eucharist; what its ceremonial; for whom it was lawful to partake of it; what were the blessings to be derived from it[3];—the whole not wearing the slightest appearance of a desire to conceal, but having all the marks of a wish to conciliate by a frank exposition of the innocence of the Christian Ritual. Indeed, in these addresses he expressly ascribes the cruelty which had been exercised towards the Christians to ignorance on the part of their enemies, and declares his wish to disperse it, that at any rate no plea of this kind might be furnished for persecution.

It would be easy to show that other primitive Fathers are as little to be accused of a wish to suppress the full knowledge of the sacraments as Justin. Both Irenæus and Tertullian, *e. g.* would supply the same sort of information respecting them as he; and whilst they may omit some of the particulars, which he gives, others they would add. Indeed, it may be remarked, that the former of these authors, when rallying the Valentinians on the folly of their theory respecting the generation of matter, makes it a ground of charge against them that they left much of it undeveloped, not wishing, he presumed, to declare it openly, but reserving the more mysterious parts for such as could pay for the information; contrary to the teaching of the Lord, "freely ye have received, freely give,"[4] language which would have scarcely been used by one who was conscious that the Church too had her secrets, which, if she did not sell, she would not at least divulge.[5] If anything whatever be wanting to complete their picture of the rites of the Primitive Church in perfect detail, it only arises from their subject not happening to lead the Fathers into it, or often from their taking for granted that allusions to ordinances familiar to the readers they were addressing, were all that was needed, or else from apprehension that the information they furnished might be turned against themselves by malicious spies. For whilst we can gather, as I said, many or perhaps all the features of such mysteries from these writers,

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 61.
[2] Ibid. [3] § 65, 66.
[4] Irenæus, I. c. iv. § 3.
[5] See also I. c. xxv. § 5, and II. c. xxvii. § 2.

we have to pick them up, as they happen to transpire, one in this treatise and another in that, as we should have to do at this day in the works of Christian writers, when not expressly engaged in handling such questions. In either case, if anything was lacking to complete the whole, it would be the effect of accidental omission, not of wilful concealment, unless when fear or prudence prompted it.

There is, however, one of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, to whom may be ascribed an intention of speaking on the mysteries of the Gospel under some reserve, with greater show of reason, than can be said of the rest, Clemens Alexandrinus, and accordingly Daillé does produce him in vindication of his remark, quoting a passage from the first book of the Stromata. "Some matters I omit purposely, making my selection deliberately, and fearing to write down what I am cautious even in speaking; not, indeed, jealous of communicating what I have to say; for that would be wrong; but apprehensive with respect to my readers, lest that by any means they should be misled and stumble, and lest I should be found, as the proverb hath it, to be putting a sword in the hand of a child;"[1] and after a while Clemens adds, "accordingly this very book will say many things enigmatically; some it will dwell upon; some it will simply announce; it will try to speak a clandestine language, at once displaying, while it conceals, and indicating, whilst it is silent."[2] There are many other passages in the Stromata to the same effect. But let us consider for a moment the object of the writings of Clemens, the plan he pursues in them, and we shall see that it is no wish to hide or mystify. the truths of the Gospel, that governs him, but merely a desire to communicate them in a manner which should recommend them, or at any rate not render them abortive. It is an illustration, I think, of Quintilian's,[3] that the minds of children are like narrow-necked bottles, and that if you would fill either the one or the other you must pour gently. Such was the view Clemens took of his duties as a teacher, having due regard to the parties who had to learn. His works, as Mr. Evans observes, may be considered of a missionary character, addressed in the first instance to heathens. The three, which have come down to us, rise each upon the

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § i. p. 324.
[2] Ibid. And again see § xii. p. 348.
[3] De Institutione Oratoriâ, I. c. ii.

other in a series of sequence: an arrangement of them which he himself indicates to us more than once. The λόγος προτρεπτικὸς or *Hortatory Address to the Greeks*, is occupied directly with converting the heathen from his idols, and turning him to Christ. The *Pædagogus* instructs the young convert in the homely practical duties which his new faith enjoins on him; the lessons supposed to be given on the way, as the Pædagogue is conducting him to a school, where he is to have still higher knowledge (γνῶσις) imparted to him. And it is the office of his last treatise, the *Stromata*, to render him this Gnostic.

But it is not merely the process of converting a heathen, which is a clue to the works of Clemens, but the process of converting and securing the conversion of a heathen of a high class; a heathen conversant with literature and philosophy; and, as was the character of the Greeks, of a fastidious temperament; a very delicate party to deal with, but the type of a most numerous body. His Hortatory Address is full of learning in various branches of it; his appeals to heathen authors in support of the positions he is advancing almost endless; a fact intimating the condition of those for whom he writes. So in his Pædagogus, when he applies the principles of the Gospel to the minute details of daily life, and teaches the effects they ought to produce on ordinary habits, it is clear that Clemens is contemplating the same superior rank of people. He prescribes, for instance, restraint on the employment of servants; reproves the excessive multiplication of them; "some to prepare provisions, some to deck the table, some to carve the meat; their services apportioned, some having the department of the palate, cooks, confectioners, makers of cakes, concoctors of honey, manufacturers of syrups; others engaged in cleaning the plate and setting the table in order; others cupbearers,"[1] and so on. Again he prescribes similar restrictions with regard to the fashion of furniture, and reprobates "costly bed-clothes, spangled quilts, embroidered counterpanes, purple hangings, couches with silver feet, bedsteads inlaid with ivory," and much more to the same effect.[2] The ornaments of the person, which he reviews, seals, rings, shoes, artificial hair, &c., still bespeak that the parties with whom Clemens has to do are of the refined, the wealthy, the luxurious orders;

[1] Pædagogus, III. c. iv. p. 268. [2] II. c. ix. pp. 216, 217.

a refutation, by the way, of one of Gibbon's sneers. No wonder therefore that when he comes to put the finishing hand to his convert, and represents, as he does in the Stromata, his perfect Christian; his new man; his genuine Gnostic; the spiritual character which must be his; his sublime motives[1]; his approximation to God[2]; his empire over his passions and appetites[3]; his internal devotion[4]; his superiority to persecution, and even to death[5];—no wonder, I say, that when he contemplated what his heathen converts were, or very lately had been, nursed in the lap of excessive luxury, and enervated by the debasing and sensual influences to which they had been exposed from their tenderest years, and then considered what he was now exhorting them to become, what self-restraint, what strong mortification, what pure and unblemished lives it was now at length time to recommend to them, he should have thought it prudent to come to them very delicately, and should have almost started at the sound of his own steps, as he approached a subject so likely to irritate and alarm them. These feelings, I think, are enough to account for the temper in which the opening of the first book is framed; a temper certainly perplexing at first sight: the long apology it contains for composing books at all; the excessive fastidiousness, not to say timidity, with which Clemens there dwells on the circumspection with which he must express himself. But it was no priestly love of mystification that Clemens was here indulging, as Daillé would hint,[6] but simply a fear to give offence to very squeamish persons, and so to ruin the great work he had on hand. And possibly if more of this spirit had been shown in our own efforts to Christianize heathendom, our success would have been greater. With this key to the writings of Clemens, I do not think that they would be found so unintelligible as Daillé would represent them to be.[7]

Nor is this consideration to be neglected in estimating the style of Clemens; for the *style* of these primitive writers is another cause of their obscurity according to Daillé.[8] The learning of Clemens, it seems, destroys his perspicuity. He introduces into his Christian philosophy so many matters alien

[1] Stromat. IV. § xxii. pp. 625. 629.
[2] § xxiii. p. 632; VII. § xvi. pp. 890. 894.
[3] VI. § ix. pp. 775. 777.
[4] § xii. 790, 791.
[5] IV. § iii. 568; § vii. 587; § ix. 597.
[6] Daillé, p. 137.
[7] p. 138.
[8] p. 139.

from his subject, however ornamental and acceptable to mere scholars, that he constantly gets into the clouds. Perhaps on a perusal of the books of Clemens, without any reference to the plan on which they are composed, we might subscribe to the censure of Daillé. Yet Clemens himself, on more occasions than one, distinctly apologizes for his style, not as though he thought it artificial, but homely. "We have already said that we have taken no care, and bestowed no pains, about our Greek: for this only suffices to lead away the many from the truth: whereas genuine philosophy will not profit the hearers of it by its language, but by its sentiment. And in my opinion he who is solicitous about truth, must not compose his phraseology with art or study, but will simply endeavour to express, as he can, what he means, for the subject-matter itself escapes those who are occupied about the diction, and are only intent upon that."[1] It should seem, therefore, that in introducing his multifarious reading into his works Clemens was regulated by some other principle than that of style, and that his principle probably was the one I have already alluded to, a hope of recommending the Gospel to learned and captious men, through the literature, which was familiar to them; a hope in which Origen, his successor in the same school, participated, who writes to one of his pupils that he would have him apply to the Grecian philosophy as a prelude to revelation, and expresses an opinion, that as the sciences were considered to be tributary to philosophy, so should philosophy be considered tributary to Christianity,[2] and also appears to have given expression to this theory in the same manner as Clemens, by composing a work, which, like his, had for its title the Stromata; the fragments of which (for fragments are all that we have of it) would lead us to think, that as in name, so in substance, it resembled its precursor,[3] and probably contributed to secure for its author the character which Eusebius tell us was assigned to him, "even by the Greeks themselves, of being a great philosopher."[4] Hence Clemens' use of the word philosophy for Christianity, and philosopher for Christian.[5]

[1] Stromat. II. § i. p. 429. And compare Stromat. VII. § xviii. p. 902.

[2] Origen, Epist. ad Gregorium, Vol. I. p. 30, Bened. Ed.

[3] In proof of this compare the fragment from the 6th book of the Stromata of Origen, Vol. I. p. 39, on the subject of falsehood, with a very corresponding passage in Clemens, Stromat. VII. § ix. p. 863, and § xii. p. 881.

[4] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 18.

[5] Clem. Alex. Stromat. IV. § viii. p. 590.

Hence his assertion that whilst revelation came primarily from God for man's instruction, philosophy came secondarily, and even primarily to the Greeks, whom the Lord had not yet called, being to them what the law was to the Hebrews, the schoolmaster, which had led unto Christ.[1] Hence his phrase that Plato was the philosopher of the Hebrews[2]; that he was nothing else than Moses speaking Attic.[3] Hence his theory that the Grecian philosophy had abstracted and detached for itself a shred from the theology of the everlasting Word.[4] Hence his repeated endeavours to represent Abraham as a *natural* philosopher, a character which was eventually sublimed into a lover of God.[5] Hence his inclination to approximate heathen, Jew and Christian; it was one and the self-same God, who was known by the Greeks ἐθνικῶς, by the Jews Ἰουδαϊκῶς, by the Christians καινῶς καὶ πνευματικῶς.[6] Hence his declaration in favour of an eclectic philosophy, *i. e.* a philosophy made up of all portions of *truth* which are found in all sects.[7] Hence his doctrine that all true philosophy that ever was in the world, traces up to Christ the primæval teacher, later philosophers referring their knowledge to Zeno, Aristotle, Epicurus, Socrates; they in their turn referring theirs to Pythagoras, Pherecydes, Thales; the masters of these again having been the Egyptians, Indians, Babylonians: the scale thus ascending to the original parents of mankind: they again not gathering their knowledge from the angels, for the two parties had no organs adapted to mutual communication, and God is above all; but imbibing all their ideas from the fontal source, the everlasting Son.[8] Hence again his discovery of Christian allegories in heathen fables. "Sail past her song," says he, meaning the song of the Sirens, whose story he was now telling with Homer, quoting his verses, and adapting them to his purpose—"Sail past her song—it works death—only desire it and you have conquered death—and binding yourself to the mast (τῷ ξύλῳ, the mast in the case of Ulysses, the Cross in the case of Christians) you shall be delivered

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § v. p. 331.
[2] Ὁ ἐξ Ἑβραίων φιλόσοφος.—I. § i. p. 321.
[3] Τί γάρ ἐστι Πλάτων ἢ Μωσῆς ἀττικίζων;—I. § xxii. p. 411.
[4] I. § xiii. p. 349.
[5] Ἀντὶ φυσιολόγου σοφὸς καὶ φιλόθεος γενόμενος.—V. § i. p. 648; and VI. § x. p. 780.
[6] VI. § v. p. 761.
[7] I. § xiv. p. 351.
[8] VI. § vii. p. 769.

from all corruption."[1] Hence his searching for testimonies in the writings of the heathens even to the evangelical virtues of faith, hope, and charity[2]; and his tracing the terms *ἀναγέννησις* and *λόγος* to a heathen nomenclature.[3] In short, whatever avenue seems to him likely, either directly or indirectly, to tempt an educated and refined heathen to Christ he avails himself of, avowedly and without scruple, and in a degree which often verges upon impropriety, if it does not pass the line.

This feature of the style of Clemens admits of being developed almost to any extent; but let what I have said suffice to show that when Clemens indulges it, he does so not capriciously, and out of ostentation merely, but upon a principle, a principle which pervades his whole work; and that attention to this principle being constantly maintained, his own hope will be realised, viz. "that the seeds of truth which he has scattered here and there, escaping the notice of jackdaws, who might pick them up and devour them, were they more conspicuous and obtrusive, may fall in with a good and intelligent husbandman, and by him be turned to account, and be productive of a harvest."[4] In other words, we may reasonably expect, that, provided with the clue I have said, we shall not find in the style of Clemens that obscurity which Daillé imputes to it.

The style of Tertullian he falls foul of in the same way—Tertullian and Clemens being the only two of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, whom he taxes by name and at any length with this defect. So many novel words does Tertullian use, so many legal ones, there is in him so much subtlety, so much acuteness, that he requires most sagacious readers to understand him; no learning, no attention being too great for such a task. I should not have thought it necessary to notice this part of Daillé's treatise, as it brings no other charge against these Fathers than that they are sometimes hard to construe, did I not feel that he still exaggerates; and that his exaggerations have an object which we shall eventually detect. Moreover, I am not unwilling to prevent those who might give credit to all his remarks from being scared out of reading an author re-

[1] Cohort. ad Gentes, § xii. p. 91.
[2] Stromat. V. § ii. p. 652.
[3] V. § ii. pp. 653, 654.
[4] Stromat. I. § xii. p. 348.

presented by him as so difficult. Let them take courage. Difficult he, no doubt, is; though some of his treatises far more so than others; that difficulty often arising, as Daillé says, from his use of strange words; more often from his use of common words in a strange sense, or in a strange grammatical construction. Nor is it his nomenclature only, it might be added, that is in fault. The indistinctness with which he frequently expresses himself is a further hindrance; his phrase so indefinite, or so equivocal, that nothing but the general drift of his argument fixes it; his use of abstract terms, his affectation, his refinement, his great love of the ironical and sarcastic, a weapon which he often wields in such a way that it cannot always be discovered at once whether he is in jest or in earnest; in short, the utter want of simplicity that pervades him—all this, no doubt, renders him an author far from easy. But it is surprising how many or all of these difficulties disappear after you have made yourself familiar with his manner; nothing illustrates him so much as himself; and so true to himself is he, so peculiar, so idiosyncratic, that after you have read one or two of his tracts, and your feelings warm to him, as they infallibly will, for he is a most powerful and striking writer, you wonder at the obstacles you once found in him, and the progress you make in him now: his strange words or strange expressions being often repeated, repeated of course in different combinations with the context, enable you to get at their meaning before long; and his ambiguous sentences, when brought into comparison with one another, acquire a more distinct and definite value. If you note down extraordinary terms or combinations as they occur, the chances are you will find something in the further course of your reading of the author which will explain them; and thus you will be making a glossary for yourselves, or at least be enlarging and rendering more complete that at the end of Priorius' edition of Rigaltius, which, though very useful, is very far from perfect. You will perceive, too, in dealing with this writer more than with most others, that a passage which has been insuperable to-day will give out its meaning to you to-morrow; your thoughts happening in the latter case to fall in with your subject better; just as you catch a pattern on silk in one light, and lose it in every other. It is advisable, therefore, in reading Tertullian to note down your interpretation of every passage that at all

perplexes you at the moment; for of this you may be sure, that if when your mind is heated with this author you do not hit off his meaning readily and without an effort, on laying him aside for a year and lighting on the same, you will not have a chance of understanding it, and will be sorry you did not secure your interpretation when you had it; for, as craftsmen say, *your hand must be in* to make anything of a work like this.

On the whole, what I would have you conclude from these practical hints is this, that Tertullian is difficult, but not so difficult as he is reputed to be, or as he seems to be at first sight, or on a casual opening of a page of him; that, in general, he is to be mastered by making him his own interpreter; and that Daillé must not alarm you. He had an object beyond the obvious one, in dwelling upon the obscurity of the style of the Fathers, which presently peeps out; and on that account I have spoken more at length on the case of Tertullian, which was, perhaps, the strongest he could produce. For he applies this argument of obscurity of style to weaken what seems to be so evidently the testimony of the Fathers to the great dignity of the Eucharist; to the solemn claims of Episcopacy; and in general to what are called high-church views on other controverted points.[1] They spoke, he would have you believe, on these topics in that characteristic style of theirs which he had been condemning; a style capable of being greatly misapprehended; hazy and rhetorical; much allowance therefore to be made for it, and their seeming sense modified.[2] Possibly there may be some ground for this remark afforded by inflated expressions in the Post-Nicene Fathers; and it is quite clear from the whole tenor of Daillé's book that his mind was under a strong Post-Nicene influence: his examples and almost all the defects he attributes to the Fathers speedily settling to that period. But these high-church doctrines (as it is now the fashion ignorantly to call them) which Daillé would thus qualify, are often advanced by the Ante-Nicene Fathers in terms so simple and incidental, that even where their style on the whole may be called figurative, they cannot be mistaken; and besides the same are taught by those among them who have no rhetoric in them at all.

[1] Daillé, p. 143. [2] Ibid.

Irenæus, for instance, is a mere controversialist, and does not deal in flowers of speech: yet we find these notions, of which I am speaking, put forward by him without misgiving. You perceive him, for example, expressing himself on the Eucharist, in the language, not precise in its meaning certainly, but still in the language of sacrifice[1]; and testifying to portions of its ritual, such as Daillé would not approve of—an invocation or ἐπίκλησις on the elements,[2] and a mixed chalice[3]: and on Episcopacy in terms which Daillé would object to no less; representing Bishops as receiving the office of government from the Apostles[4]; as the Apostles' successors and vicars[5]; as proceeding from them in an unbroken line; as being in number one and only one at a time in one Church, even in so great a Church as Rome[6]; as accompanied by Presbyters when they gave Paul his meeting at Miletus,[7] though the text in the Acts says elders only, making no distinction between the two orders. You hear him teaching the necessity of cleaving to this Church, this Episcopal Church, for he knew no other[8]; of the sin of secession from it; the cases of Nadab and Abihu, of Korah, Dathan and Abiram, parallel to theirs, who do secede[9]; and much more to the same effect. So that it is impossible, so long as words are allowed to have any meaning at all, to lower these Fathers to the sense to which Daillé would reduce them.

The last cause of obscurity under the head of style of which Daillé takes notice, and it is with great naïveté that he does so, is that the changes which have taken place in the institutions of the Church as well as of States since the days of the Fathers, have given the phraseology of the early centuries quite another meaning from that which it used to have. What, he exclaims, is become of the ancient discipline, of the canons, of the mystical ceremonies of Baptism and the Eucharist, of the rites of Ordination? All these matters are defunct and passed away.[10] A new age has called for new customs. But the writings of the ancients are replete with these subjects; how difficult, therefore, to determine their meaning now. Then the very terms of former times circulate in quite another

[1] Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 1.
[2] I. c. xiii. § 2.
[3] Ibid.
[4] III. c. iii. § 1.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.
[7] III. c. xiv. § 2.
[8] III. c. xxiv.
[9] IV. c. xxvi. § 2.
[10] Daillé, p. 149.

sense. We talk still of Pope, Patriarch, Mass, Oblation, Station, Procession, Indulgence, &c., but no longer attach to them the same ideas as they of old. Just as under the Roman Emperors, the titles of the magistrates remained the same as under the Republic, but their offices were altogether different. If we meet with the word Pope in an old writer, as a designation of the Bishop of Rome, our thoughts forthwith pass to the pomp and circumstance of the modern sovereign Pontiff, his running footmen, his body guard, and so on[1]; but this is not the train of thought that old writers dreamed of awaking by the use of the term. Hence further obscurity! But to what does this argument amount? That because the Church has gradually swerved from the institutions and rules, which prevailed in it soon after the times of our blessed Lord and the Apostles, we are not to endeavour to bring them back to those purer times by a reference to the old standard and a correction of the aberrations, which it indicates; but rather throw the standard away as antiquated, as no longer intelligible or easily read. Surely if the term Pope, *e. g.* is used by the primitive Fathers, as it is, indiscriminately for the Bishop of Rome, or for other Bishops, and represents a personage very different in his pretensions from him who has borne the same name in later times, we should not charge the original term with obscurity on that account, but draw the wholesome inference, that the Bishop of Rome is no longer what he once was in the least corrupt period of the Church; and take courage that our Reformed Church has not swerved from primitive usage in establishing towards him the relations she has! That he had exalted himself too highly, and was in some sort to be abased! As, on the other hand, if the discipline, the canons, the Sacraments, the rite of Orders, as observed in the modern Church, have all sunk very greatly below the mark which they attained unto in the Primitive Church, we must not complain of the meaning attached to these uses and ordinances of old being very different from that attached to them now, and affect not to understand what the ancient writers say of them; but confess that the age has become less devotional; that there is less reverence for God's ordinances now than there was in the days of Tertullian and Cyprian. That,

[1] Daillé, p. 149.

in short, these holy things have been humbled too greatly and must be exalted. And instead of putting the Fathers aside, as Daillé would recommend, not unnaturally, and telling people that they are so full of perplexities that it is not worth their while to examine them, we shall cherish them as affording a testimony plain enough to those who are not wilfully blind to it, which is equally unpropitious to the Papist and the Puritan, and which, on the whole, is calculated to satisfy us, that the Reformed Church of England is very much nearer to the Primitive than either of them.

LECTURE VIII.

Clemens Alexandrinus the only Ante-Nicene Father charged with disingenuousness by Daillé. His instance from Cardinal Perron. Passages liable to misconstruction in Clemens and in Origen. Inference of Daillé from the illogical reasoning of the Fathers disputed. Their use of the *argumentum ad hominem* explained. Value of their testimony notwithstanding. Instances of inconsistency from Clemens and from Tertullian. Relative importance of different topics not confounded by the Fathers. Daillé's instances to the contrary examined. The early Fathers fair exponents of the sentiments of the early Church; especially where they were identified with their respective Churches; and where they concur with each other. Allowance to be made for the peculiar character of their times.

THE next objection, which Daillé takes to the Fathers, is on the ground of their disingenuousness. What they believe they often suppress, and what they don't believe they often say.[1] This objection has been in part disposed of in a former Lecture, when we considered the reasonable causes there might be, and were, for their exercising some discretion in communicating the mysteries of the Gospel to ill-informed or ill-disposed heathens, a discretion which in part exposed them to this animadversion. But the present indictment goes beyond this, and impugns their honesty, attributing to them an intention of misleading, by interpreting Scripture occasionally *κατ' οἰκονομίαν*, or economicè, as it is called: a germ, it may be considered, of the pious frauds of later times. Daillé gives no sufficient instance of such dishonesty in any Ante-Nicene Father; for the single instance he cites from the Pædagogue of Clemens Alexandrinus, as suggested to him by Cardinal Perron, namely, the expression, "The Flesh and Blood of Christ is faith and the promise,"[2] as though Clemens suppressed the full force of the words in order to cast a mist before the eyes of the Catechumens, who were not yet prepared for the truth, is surely a very unsatisfactory one. It occurs, I conceive, for

[1] Daillé, pp. 150. 158. 160. [2] p. 157.

Daillé gives no reference, in the sixth chapter of the first book of the Pædagogue.[1] Clemens is there employed in adapting St. Paul's phrase, "I have fed you with milk, and not with meat," to the argument of this chapter, which is to show that when the Scripture speaks of Christians as children or babes, it does not mean, as the Gnostics would have it, that Churchmen were mere novices in knowledge. But the subject of meat and drink prompting him, he proceeds to remark "elsewhere also the Lord in the Gospel of John hath expressed himself by symbols after another kind, saying, 'Eat my Flesh and drink my Blood,' where he makes the cup an evident symbol of faith and the promise." But surely it is a refinement on Clemens to suppose that he talked in this manner, because his hearers were not prepared for the doctrine of Transubstantiation, which is what Cardinal Perron would insinuate; and which doctrine, though he secretly held it, he would not venture openly to announce. Plain persons would suppose that he meant what he said, and that, having found St. Paul speaking of milk and meat as figures, and wishing further to illustrate the use of such figurative language in Scripture, he adduced the Lord's words in St. John, when He spoke of his Flesh and Blood as another example of *figures*. For it would be singular indeed, on the supposition of the truth of Perron's hypothesis, that Clemens should over and over again express himself on the subject of the Eucharist in terms so clearly opposed to the doctrine of Transubstantiation as these, and sometimes much more clearly,[2] and never indeed once speak of it in terms asserting or even implying his belief or even knowledge of that doctrine, and yet himself have no doubt about it all the while! Surely it is a strange way of dealing with the Fathers, or with any other authors, to contend without any proof whatever, that they believed in this, that, or the other doctrine, only that they were withheld by circumstances from saying so, and then abuse them for disingenuousness. At this rate what doctrine might you not ascribe to them, and what duplicity might you not lay to their charge? And it is a singular instance of the manner in which extremes meet, that Daillé, a foreign Protestant, should thus adopt the argument of Perron, a Romanist, and

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 121. [2] See particularly Pædag. II. c. ii. p. 186.

that Calvinists and Romanists should thus be content to hunt in couples, provided they can but run down the Fathers.

Still there do occur to me some passages in Clemens, which are capable of misconstruction. Thus Clemens in one place is engaged in showing that the Greeks derived their knowledge from Moses. "Strategy," says he, "or the art of the general, is comprised in three ideas, the safe, the hazardous, and that which is a combination of both; and each of these elements again is composed of three properties, words, deeds, and the one and the other together. And all these will take effect, if sometimes persuasion, sometimes force, sometimes damage, be resorted to, when reprisals are made; and in the concerns in which we are engaged, if sometimes we act justly, *sometimes with deceit*, sometimes speak the truth, sometimes adopt certain of all these alternatives at one and the same time: now all these matters, and the best manner of turning each of them to account, the Greeks derived from Moses and profited by."[1] And then Clemens proceeds to give instances of Moses' strategies in conducting the Israelites out of Egypt. Still there is here not so much an approval of artifice, even in the service of a good cause, as a matter of fact stated, viz. that the Greeks derived their *tactics*, whatever they might have become in their hands, from Moses—an instance in proof of the general proposition he had announced, that they derived most of their knowledge from him. Again, he says of his Gnostic, "Whatever, therefore, he has in his mind, the same he has on his tongue; both speaking and acting with respect to those who are worthy to be his hearers, in a spirit of concurrence and honest interest. For he at once thinks truth and utters it, unless at any time he prevaricates or repeats a prevarication,[2] as the sophists have it, for the sake of working a cure; as the physician acts by his patients for the sake of recovering them."[3] But then the case by which Clemens goes on to illustrate this principle, viz. St. Paul's circumcision of Timothy in spite of his having said circumcision availeth nothing, and thus to the Jews becoming a Jew, shows the innocent kind of deception, if I may so speak, which

[1] Stromat. I. § xxiv. p. 417.

[2] *Ψεύσεται ἢ ψεῦδος ἐρεῖ*, perhaps, "conceives or speaks a prevarication," parallel to *ἀληθῆ τε γὰρ φρονεῖ ἕμα καὶ ἀληθεύει* in the former clause.

[3] Stromat. VII. § ix. p. 863.

Clemens was contemplating, when he used the expression I have quoted. And this view of the subject is confirmed by another passage in the same book of the Stromata. "The Gnostic also is cautious in using the principle of accommodation, that he may not be misinterpreted, and that accommodation may not become a habit;"[1] as though he felt that, even in its most innocent form, it was a principle that required watching.

In a fragment of the Stromata of Origen (preserved, however, in the Latin translation of Jerome his adversary[2]) occurs a discussion extremely similar to this of Clemens; the same startling proposition; the same qualification of it; and the same caveat: and of this too, out of candour and a desire to represent the Fathers as they are, I make Daillé a present. It is one, which, probably, both he and Barbeyrac would have advanced, had it suggested itself to them. Having quoted a paragraph from the third book of the Republic of Plato, in which Plato speaks of a lie as unworthy of God, but sometimes profitable to men—still only to be used by them as a medicine is used by physicians, which none but physicians must meddle with—Origen proceeds to remark, that though God may, for the benefit of the hearer, express the truth ambiguously and by parables, thus casting a veil over what might be injurious in it if announced nakedly to the uninformed, "still the man on whom the necessity of telling a lie presses, must be very careful so to use his lie as if it were a medicine; to make it keep within the bounds which Judith observed when, using it against Holofernes, she prevailed over him by a prudent craft in her words. He must imitate Esther, who, by suppressing all mention of the race she belonged to, changed the sentence of Artaxerxes: and still more, the Patriarch Jacob, who, we read, obtained his father's blessing by an artful lie—whence it is clear, that, unless we so lie, as that some great good is our object in so doing, we shall be condemned as the enemies of Him who said, 'I am the truth,'" —the whole, it will be perceived, resolving itself into a case of casuistry, such as that entertained by Bishop Taylor in the "Ductor Dubitantium," Book III., c. ii., Rule V. "Whether it can in any case be lawful to tell a lie"—a question in which

[1] Ἀσφαλὴς δὲ ἐν συμπεριφορᾷ ὁ γνωστικὸς μὴ λάθῃ, ἢ ἡ συμπεριφορὰ διάθεσις γένηται.—Stromat. VII. § xii. p. 881.

[2] Origen, Vol. i. p. 39, Bened. Ed.

he finds much room for discrimination—quoting, in the course of it, the instances of the Israelitish midwives, and of Rahab.

There is another objection akin to this last, which Daillé urges against the Fathers.[1] That in their polemics, in their disputations against heathens, Jews, and heretics, they stuck at nothing, in order to secure to themselves the victory: urging arguments which were in their favour, though they felt them to be faulty, and suppressing others, which were against them, which they knew to be sound. Hence a further difficulty in getting at the real sentiments of the Fathers. There is some truth in this remark; but the fact itself furnishes me with a different conclusion from that which Daillé draws from it. For he once more chimes in with the Romanist, and confesses, that, perplexed by such disputants, he sees nothing for it but to throw oneself on the Church as the interpreter of the Fathers who are so ambiguous, *i. e.* on the Church of Rome[2]; thus implying that the Fathers must be abandoned as an authority, at least by *Protestants*. On the other hand, the conclusion I come to is this; that seeing the Fathers are such writers as they are here represented to be, it is highly necessary not only to read them, but to read them *carefully*, in order to *detect* the complexion of their argument, and the grounds on which it proceeds, and to make the necessary allowance for circumstances: that the true redress of the inconvenience is, not to throw the Fathers away in despair, or apply to Rome for a key to them, but really to investigate them, and not pursue Dr. Priestley's plan of *looking through* books,[3] with which Bishop Horsley taxes him so severely; a plan which is sure to mislead, and the adoption of which is, in fact, the source of so much of the perplexity which people find in them. Certainly, there is no argument more common with the Fathers, as I have often taken occasion to observe in my Lectures on them, than the *argumentum ad hominem*—or, in other words, the argument for victory, as Daillé says—but it is one that creates no difficulty to those who approach it in the course of the regular study of these authors: the context and general drift of the reasoning point it out to be what it is: but select out of the whole some detached passage, and it

[1] Daillé, pp. 158, 159, *et seq.*

[2] p. 163. In the Latin translation, which was ab auctore recognitum, auctum et emendatum. In the French the passage is not found.

[3] Horsley's Letters, p. 100.

is not improbable, that a meaning may be assigned to it altogether at variance with the real sentiments of the authors. I believe that the Fathers have been often laid under contribution by Socinians in this manner, and extracts made from them, which, had those extracts been only fragments that had survived their other works, would have infallibly conveyed the impression that *they* were Socinians, though nothing was more untrue. For example, "The Son of God, called Jesus, may well enough be called the Son of God on account of his wisdom, even if he *be but a mere man*, for all writers call God the Father of gods and men,"[1] writes Justin. Suppose this had been the only paragraph in Justin that had come down to us; and it had not, accordingly, been known that, when uttering it, Justin was pleading the Christian cause before heathen Emperors, and was fighting them with their own weapons; would not the Socinian have had very specious reasons for claiming him as a witness on his side? But take all the circumstances into account, and there is no fear of the peculiar nature of the argument misleading. Or take another case, much resembling this, in the Apology of Tertullian. "Suppose him (Jesus Christ) to be a man, if you will: it is God's pleasure to be worshipped through him and in him—so that we reply upon the *Jews*, that they also learned to worship God through Moses, a man—whilst upon the *Greeks* we retort, Orpheus bound mankind by religious obligations in Pieria, Musæus at Athens, Melampus at Argos, Trophonius in Bœotia. And if I look to you, ye rulers of the nations, what was Pompilius Numa, who loaded the Romans with rites the most onerous, but a man?"[2] Here again, we have Tertullian arguing upon his adversaries' principles, not upon his own; for his own undoubted belief in the consubstantial and co-eternal Godhead of the Son we have seen proved in a former Lecture by numberless passages in his writings, which I shall not therefore repeat. Yet how readily might the spirit of Tertullian be misunderstood by one who stumbled upon this passage, and knew little of the author besides. Cases of this kind might be produced out of the Fathers to almost any amount; who in contending with heathens especially, content themselves very frequently with si-

[1] Justin Martyr, Apolog. I. § 22. [2] Tertullian, Apolog. c. xxi.

lencing their antagonists by arguments which do indeed serve that purpose, but which cannot possibly produce any general conviction—as, that if Christ was the messenger of God to men, *they* cannot stumble at this article of the Christians' creed, for that such was the office of Mercury, according to their own—that if Christ, according to the Christians, ascended into heaven, *they* were not in a condition to resent that point of faith, for that so, according to themselves, did Bellerophon. But in such reasoning there is no danger of mistaking the meaning of your author, if you are reading him in earnest. The context always protects you, and your general knowledge of his principles. Who, for instance, in the examples I have cited, would really run any risk of supposing that, because a Father of the Church placed the Incarnate Word in apposition to the messenger Mercury, he considered the evidence in one case the same as that in the other, or similar to it? And the like remark holds good in other instances of a less glaring character than this. In short, in such circumstances his very speech bewrayeth him; and you see when he is arguing for truth, and when for victory—indeed it is the perception of the difference that must have preceded and suggested the complaint to Daillé.

Another incident, which Daillé alleges against the Fathers as contributing to their obscurity, is their changes of opinion.[1] He produces, indeed, no examples of this defect in the Ante-Nicene Fathers at least, except a confession of Origen's recorded by Jerome,[2] that in his old age he repented of many things which he had taught and written in his youth, a confession which need not, one may think, be deemed peculiar to Origen or to any Father. There is no doubt, however, that instances of such alteration in their sentiments will be found even in the Ante-Nicene Fathers by those who shall be curious in comparing them with themselves. Few writers, indeed, would be proof against such a scrutiny. And often there are peculiar circumstances in the case of the Fathers which would explain some apparent inconsistencies. Thus we find Clemens Alexandrinus, and indeed most of the primitive Fathers at variance with themselves on the subject of the corruption of human nature, sometimes using expressions that argue such

[1] Daillé, p. 165. [2] p. 166.

corruption to be extreme, and sometimes expressions that argue it to be trifling. In one place, for instance, Clemens quotes, in support of his own views, the strong phraseology of Barnabas, that "the heart of the natural man is an habitation of devils."[1] And again he elsewhere says, that "we are not good and virtuous by nature, but by training; as good physicians or good pilots are made by the same."[2] Whilst in other places he speaks of "our evil passions as contrary to nature,"[3] and of "man being by nature a high and lofty animal that seeks after what is good."[4] The truth probably is, that Clemens, as well as others like him, were embarrassed on this subject by the plain declarations of Scripture, and the testimony of their own hearts on the one hand, and by their horror of the heresy of Valentinus, Marcion, and indeed of the Gnostics in general, on the other, who maintained that the world was created evil by the Demiurgus, and indeed alleged this fact of its corruption as their main weapon against the orthodox doctrine, that *God* made it[5]: not to speak of another cause of such inconsistencies to which I have before had occasion to advert, viz. that questions of this kind, however fruitful sources of controversy in later ages of the Church, had not then attracted the attention of religious disputants, nor been stated in precise terms.

Again, Clemens may be thought to be inconsistent with himself on the question of asceticism; sometimes seeming, as he does, to encourage habits of moderation, sometimes habits of extreme mortification and self-discipline. Thus he admits the use of the bath, though he denounces its excess[6]: does not proscribe the wearing of gold, &c., and the putting on of delicate clothing, but only requires a bit and a bridle to be employed to curb the irrational appetites[7]; prescribes plainness of attire for women in general, but says there may be occasion for relaxing this law, and that allowance must be made for those women who have formed imprudent marriages, and who must adorn their persons to please their husbands.[8] All this is said in the spirit of concession. On the other hand, he will have a man discipline himself into knowledge and per-

[1] Stromat. II. § xx. p. 489.
[2] I. § vi. p. 336.
[3] II. § xiii. p. 460.
[4] Pædag. III. c. vii. p. 276.
[5] See especially Stromat. IV. § xiii. p. 605; V. § xiv. p. 731.
[6] Pædag. III. c. ix. p. 282.
[7] c. xi. p. 285.
[8] p. 287.

fection, till he shall be able to live without a lapse.[1] He will have him prepare himself for the conflict, like the wrestler.[2] His whole life must be a holy festival.[3] Sacrifices, and prayers, and praises and Scripture-readings before meals—psalms and hymns at meals, and before bed—prayers again at night—a continued effort to identify himself with the company of heaven by contemplation, which never relaxes[4]; a keen pursuit after the honourable and useful, but an abandonment of pleasure to those who would lead a base and trivial life.[5] But the former sentiments prevail in the Pædagogue, the latter in the Stromata; and the difference in their character, whatever it may be, is to be accounted for by the different persons with whom those treatises have to deal, the novice and the veteran Christian, rather than by any mutability of opinion in Clemens himself.

In Tertullian certainly the inconsistencies are more numerous and more unequivocal. Now he represents the Christians as willing to suffer, but having no delight in the danger before them[6]: then he represents them as volunteering persecution, and as having greater satisfaction in being condemned than in being acquitted.[7] Now he speaks of the man of sin as hindered in his coming by the existence of the Roman commonwealth, and as about to be let loose on its cessation[8]: then he speaks of the Roman empire as destined to endure, as long as the world itself shall endure.[9] Now he tells of the image of God as destroyed (elisam) at the Fall[10]; the spirit of man as transfigured by it[11]; the *entire substance* of man as changed from purity to perverseness[12]: then he tells of the *innocent* age of children—not an accidental expression—but as excusing delay in Baptism.[13] Now he talks of marriage as a contumelia communis[14]: then he speaks of that estate as one which is pronounced blessed by God in the words, Increase and multiply,[15] as an estate against which Paul threw out a caution only because the time was short.[16] Now he explains

[1] Stromat. VII. § vii. p. 859.
[2] p. 860.
[3] Παννήγυρις ἁγία.—Ibid.
[4] p. 861. [5] Ibid.
[6] Tertullian, Apol. c. xlix.
[7] Ad Scapulam, c. i. c. ii.
[8] Apol. c. xxxii.
[9] Ad Scapulam, c. ii.
[10] De Cultu Fœminarum, I. c. i.
[11] II. c. v.
[12] De Spectaculis, c. ii.
[13] De Baptismo, c. xviii.
[14] De Virgin. Veland. c. x.
[15] De Animâ, c. xxvii.
[16] Adv. Marcion. V. c. vii.

St. Paul's expression of being baptized for the *dead*, of having a living person submitted to a vicarious Baptism for a dead one[1]: then he explains it as being baptized for the *body* (which is dead) in order that the resurrection of that body may be implied by it.[2] Now he understands Antichrist to be the man who had denied that Christ had come in the flesh[3]: then he understands him of the persecuting government of imperial Rome.[4] Now he lays down his rule against heretics, who were all of recent date, that "what was true was first, what was spurious afterwards:"[5] then he elsewhere explains St. Paul's phrase of the Church being without spot or wrinkle, sine rugâ *vetustatis*, ut virgo.[6] Now he quotes the Shepherd of Hermas as an authority[7]: then he designates it as "apocryphal and false."[8] Now he contemplates *one pardon* for sin after Baptism[9]: then he does not allow that there is even one.[10] Now he contends for Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, and makes it the very scandal of the heretic that he confounds them with one another, and with laymen[11]: then he is for a spiritual Church regardless of Bishops.[12] Something of this incongruity may doubtless be ascribed to the physical constitution of Tertullian, which was hot and hasty in the extreme, perfervidum ingenium—he frequently laments it as a disaster. "I confess to the Lord God," says he, "that I have rashly, not to say audaciously, ventured to compose a work on *Patience*, a virtue which I am myself very ill qualified to recommend;"[13] and he afterwards describes himself as "most miserable" by reason of this defect of temper; and his writings abound in similar strong expressions of self-condemnation, as if it was perpetually betraying him into error,[14] a temperament seldom connected with very fixed sentiments. But his self-contradiction is chiefly to be attributed to his Montanism; those tracts which were written after his adoption of this heresy, as compared with those written before it, furnishing the principal instances of tergiversation. For though a few of his treatises, and only a few, supply no internal evidence on

[1] De Resurrec. Carnis, c. xlviii.
[2] Adv. Marcion. V. c. x.
[3] III. c. viii.; V. c. xvi.
[4] De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. xii.
[5] Adv. Prax. c. ii.
[6] De Pudicitiâ, c. xviii.
[7] De Oratione, c. xvi.
[8] De Pudicitiâ, c. x.
[9] De Pœnitentiâ, c. v.
[10] De Pudicitiâ, c. xviii.
[11] De Præscript. Hæret. c. xli.
[12] De Pudic. c. xxi.
[13] De Patientiâ, c. i.
[14] De Cultu Fœminar. II. c. i.

this subject either way, yet a large number furnish probable evidence of what his condition was when he penned them, and a still larger number certain evidence.[1] So that with this key to them, his inconsistencies need not present to us much difficulty on the score of the *obscurity* at least, which arises from them—and that is Daillé's position—whatever else may be said of them. On the contrary, in the case of Tertullian, as in the case of regular heretics, the doctrines and rites of the orthodox Church are indirectly brought out more vividly by the mere accident of being placed in apposition with those of the seceders from it.

I do not think it necessary to examine other of the Ante-Nicene Fathers on this point, having produced Tertullian by far the strongest case of them all; and had I been content with simply replying to the proposition as Daillé advances it, I needed not have given him an advantage by volunteering the catalogue I have of the contradictions of Tertullian; but I wish to lay before you a candid exposition of the real aspect of the Fathers, be it what it may; and feel that I shall by that means convince you the rather, that Daillé, even when he had some reason for an objection, greatly exaggerates its force; in short, plays the special pleader.

And this character his next objection continues to attach to him; an objection I shall not think it needful to dwell long upon, namely, the difficulty there is in determining what degree of relative importance the Fathers assign to the various propositions they announce, and yet the necessity of knowing this before any practical use can be made of their authority.[2] Who does not see the difference, *e. g.* says Daillé, in importance between the declarations, that "Christ is God," and that "Christ suffered death when he was thirty-four or thirty-five years old," though both declarations may be true? "It is evident," Daillé proceeds, "that the Fathers themselves recognised such difference, for Irenæus writes to Victor, Bishop of Rome, when he was excommunicating whole Churches for observing Easter, as he considered, at an uncanonical time, that Anicetus, his predecessor, had tolerated the like observance of it in Polycarp, and was unwilling to disturb the peace of the Church by insisting on the necessity of such a ritual."[3]

[1] See Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 52, Third Ed.

[2] Daillé, p. 170.

[3] Eusebius, Eccl. Hist. v. c. 24.

So Tertullian, in his "De Præscriptione Hœreticorum,"[1] after having laid down his regula fidei or creed, containing the cardinal articles of faith, proceeds, "This rule, established, as we will prove, by Christ, has no doubtful or debatable points in it, as we hold, save such as heresies introduce, and such as make heretics. And let but this form stand fast in its proportion, and then you may explore and handle what you will; you may let loose the whole licence of your curiosity, if there seems to you to be anything left in ambiguity, or anything imperfectly shadowed out." And in a remarkable passage in the Epistle of Firmilianus to Cyprian, we read, "But that the brethren at Rome do not keep primitive tradition themselves in all respects, and that they pretend to the authority of the Apostles without any ground for it, one may know from this; that with respect to the time of celebrating Easter, and many other mysteries of religion, they seem to observe different customs from others; from the Church of Jerusalem, for instance; and so in many other provinces, many other things differ according to different places and names; and yet there is no departure on this account from the peace and unity of the Catholic Church."[2] From all these passages it is no doubt evident that the Fathers did recognise a great difference in the relative importance of questions they handled from time to time, a point, indeed, which scarcely required proof, if the Fathers were reasonable men, however they might not be prepared to draw up a scale of the exact estimate they took of each. But who could think of making this a ground of charge against them, or plead it in proof of the little value which attaches to their writings, by reason of the difficulty of ascertaining the *emphasis* with which they spoke on any given subject? The Scriptures themselves are open to the same objection. Nay, even Churches, with all their definite Articles, Creeds, and Liturgies, and with the pains they take to circumscribe their sense of Scripture, are still open to it. There must be still a very considerable margin in which individual opinion is left to range. Dr. Waterland, in our own Church, finds room enough for a "Discourse on Fundamentals;" and there probably are many of its members who might not agree with him after all in his selection, some

[1] c. xiv. [2] Cyprian, Ep. lxxv.

thinking his catalogue too copious, and some too sparing. The discretion, therefore, which we have to exercise in other cases, we must exercise on the Fathers, and not expect them to be categorical on subjects which do not admit of it. But before I dismiss this head, I must notice the two examples which Daillé adduces from the *Ante-Nicene* Fathers, of the manner in which they confound the relative importance of things, when they sometimes do happen to declare themselves. One of them is on the case of Infant Communion. Having quoted Augustine as saying that "Innocent had laid it down with respect to children, that unless they should eat the Flesh of the Son of man, they could have no life in them," Daillé proceeds, "and long before his time Cyprian spake on the same subject to the same purport; and that opinion, as Maldonatus testifies, prevailed in the Church about 600 years. I omit, are Maldonatus' words, the sentiment of Augustine and of Innocent the First; a sentiment which prevailed in the Church about 600 years, that the Eucharist is necessary even for infants"[1]; the word *necessariam* being printed in the Latin translation of Daillé, which was made from the French, revised, augmented and corrected by the author himself,[2] in capital letters. But Cyprian says nothing of the kind, whatever Maldonatus, as quoted by Daillé, may say for him. Cyprian, who is the first Christian writer that alludes to Infant Communion at all, does so twice; but both times are mere allusions; the fact itself, and no more, transpiring in either case incidentally, and when Cyprian was engaged in other matters with respect to these children.[3] He says nothing of its necessity. It was not the question before him. Nor can his testimony be used for anything else but the bare existence of such a practice in his time. Now surely this proceeding of Daillé's, this shuffling of names and quotations, so as to seem to get the conclusion he desires, and to make those who do not refer to his authorities, believe that he does so fairly, is at least as disingenuous an act as any he can lay to the account of the Fathers. The other instance he produces from an Ante-Nicene Father of confounding the relative importance of things, is on the subject of fasting. Who, says he, would not suppose that the whole cause of Christianity

[1] Daillé, p. 176.
[2] See Titlepage to the Latin edition. Genevæ, 1656.
[3] Cyprian, De Lapsis, § ix. and § xxv.

was at stake, when Ignatius utters the following tragical words, "Whosoever fasts on the Lord's day or the Saturday (one Saturday only excepted, that before Easter), the same is a murderer of Christ."[1] Now whatever tendency terms so extravagant may have to confound all distinctions of the lighter and weightier matters of the law, and so to render the Fathers of ambiguous value from their want of discrimination, Ignatius is at any rate innocent of the charge. For this Epistle to the Philippians is none of his, it is neither mentioned by Eusebius, who enters into a minute account of the Epistles of Ignatius, nor by Jerome, but is a spurious Epistle, written long after the time of Ignatius, and never included in the collection of his Epistles.[2] Whether Daillé was aware of this when he published his treatise "De Usu Patrum," is more than I can tell; he must have been aware of it eventually, when his attention was expressly turned, as it one day was, to the subject of the Epistles of Ignatius.

But supposing this difficulty disposed of; there is still according to Daillé another. How do we know that the sentiment of a Father was the sentiment of his Church, and not his own merely[3]? It is obvious that this objection is much more easy to make than to refute. It might, perhaps, be enough to reply that it rests with Daillé to show that the Father does not express the opinions of his Church, not with us to show that he does. Is it likely, however, that when so few Christian writings have been preserved by the Church at all, those should have happened to be preserved, which were not on the whole in accordance with her? The Church was their keeper; she saw, therefore, some merit in them which induced her to take on herself that office; she must have considered that in general they did her service. And this argument will be thought to have the more weight, if we recollect that the writings of the heretics properly so called, have been all suffered to perish: nothing of them remains except such fragments as are preserved in the works of their orthodox antagonists. For the treatise of Novatianus on the Trinity, if his, is hardly in doctrine that of a heretic in the ordinary sense of the word, supporting as it does the doctrine

[1] Daillé, p. 177; Ignatius, Ad Philipp. § xiii.

[2] See Bishop Beveridge on the Canons, Bk. II. c. vii. § vii. in Cotelerius, vol. ii. p. 110.

[3] Daillé, p. 180.

of the Church. Moreover, Eusebius, when composing his Ecclesiastical History, adopts the Fathers as his authority: and what is more, though taking advantage certainly of many other Fathers, whose works were then in existence, he does make very large use of most of those very Fathers, whose volumes have descended to our times: thus showing, that even when the Church was much fuller of such documents, still these which we actually possess were accounted amongst the most valuable, and were selected by the father of early Church History for his vouchers and witnesses. He speaks of the Epistle of Clemens as having great merit, and as read in most Churches.[1] He makes liberal use of the Epistles of Ignatius, and quotes Polycarp's commendation of them (himself a Bishop) "as being profitable to the readers of them; as containing faith and patience, and all edification pertaining to our Lord."[2] He draws much of the history of the Church in Justin's time, from Justin; and describes him as the most noted of those who flourished in his day; and as preaching the truth of God in his writings.[3] He rests a very great part of his account of early heresies on the authority of Irenæus, and quotes him as though he considered him to be the chief writer on that subject. He refers over and over again with the same confidence to Clemens Alexandrinus for the facts which his works supply, and describes those works in detail in terms of praise and approbation.[4] He enters into all the particulars of the life and writings of Origen, as one of the most famous worthies of the Church. And what is more, he speaks even of the two Latin Fathers, Cyprian and Tertullian —of the former, indeed, but as a conspicuous Bishop[5]; but of the latter, as the author of the Apology, of which he translates a passage or two into Greek,[6] a circumstance which renders his testimony to the value of this Latin writer the more weighty, inasmuch as it seems to have been an effort to him to translate from the Latin at all—for he offers a sort of excuse for his manner of doing it on another occasion in the case of the Epistle of Hadrian[7]—as though a notice of the Apology was forced upon him by the celebrity of its author.

I have run through these brief particulars in order to show,

[1] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 16.
[2] iii. c. 36.
[3] iv. c. 11.
[4] vi. c. 13, *et alibi*.
[5] vii. c. 3.
[6] iii. c. 33.
[7] iv. c. 8.

that in the judgment of Eusebius at least, a leading historian of the Church, and one who had to lay under contribution for his annals all the best authorities which existed in his own day, the works of the Fathers we now possess are considered worthy of being taken as exponents of the Church of their respective periods.

Nor is this all. The very position and character of many of these Fathers identify them with their respective Churches. Clemens Romanus was Bishop of his Church, and writes his Epistle in that Church's name. Ignatius was of the same rank. Theophilus of the same. Irenæus of the same. Cyprian of the same. Others among them were not indeed Bishops, but distinguished Presbyters of their respective Churches. And though, no doubt, there may be heterodox persons in high places, yet the presumption has been usually the other way; and in the Primitive Church most exceedingly the other way.

Then, if it be further objected, as it is by Daillé, that even allowing each Father to be in some sort a representative of the particular Church to which he belonged, yet the recognition of a doctrine or an ordinance by the *Universal* Church is the only guarantee for its soundness; it may be observed, that these early Fathers whose claims we have been so long canvassing, are drawn from almost all parts of the Christian world—one from Rome; another from Antioch; a third from the Holy Land; a fourth from Carthage; a fifth from Gaul; so that matters, in which they happen to concur, must have been of very general acceptance in the Church. Now in all, or almost all the substantial questions of Creed and of Ecclesiastical government, they will be found to concur, including many points, which would touch Daillé, and come within his category of controversies; though in some subordinate particulars there may be occasional difference; or, what is more common, one of them may assert a point on which another may be entirely silent; or by implication, may be taken to be even against it. Indeed, there were many differences or contradictions among whole Churches themselves; a whole section of Churches, *e. g.* maintaining one side of the Paschal controversy, and a whole section again, the other side: a large division of them rejecting the Baptism of heretics, and a large division of them again accepting it: incidents these in the

early history of the Church, of which Daillé does not fail to take advantage,[1] turning them to the general disparagement of the testimony of the Fathers, who first as individuals, and next as members of particular Churches, might be involved in differences with the more œcumenical voice of Christendom, and so should be thought less worth listening to. But this should be borne in mind; that you should regard the Fathers as the raw material out of which General Councils of the Church might be made; not as equivalent to General Councils. These Fathers, for whom I am pleading, lived before any General Councils, properly so called, had met; and consequently in an age, when a great many questions were unsettled in the Church: questions, which after the æra of General Councils were finally disposed of; uniformity and unanimity established by that means. Who can doubt that the several members of such General Councils, when they first met together to confer, however agreeing in the main, brought along with them several different sentiments on several different points; and that it was not till after long conference and mutual illumination, that they could be reduced to agree upon the sense and wording of the Canons or Constitutions they were met to frame? The Fathers may be considered in the condition of such members when first they came together—only never having been brought together themselves, they have never of themselves adjusted their respective sentiments; and you are left to do it for them. You must compare them together, and by drawing deductions from them, fashion for yourselves the most primitive of all Canons. The conference is not at Nice, or Constantinople, or Ephesus, but in your own study. The delegates are not reverend speakers from divers Churches, but stately folios from your shelves: and accordingly, after having compared them patiently and without prejudice, and having heard all that each of them has to say, you will combine their testimony into one. And even as in other Councils, so in this, must allowance be made for the peculiar character of the times in which it assembles, a consideration which would go far to answer the objection, or scoff, or sarcasm of Daillé, that the Millenarians themselves could boast, not of one Father, but of many Fathers on their side—though it would have been only fair in him to say that Justin confesses many did not hold this doctrine,

[1] Daillé, p. 187, *et seq.*

though he and those, whom he considered orthodox, did[1]: and that Eusebius tells us, it was propagated by Papias, who took in a literal sense what the Apostles had said in a mystical one.[2] What, however, if this doctrine has been exploded of late years—quiet times have a tendency to hush all transcendental and mysterious questions, as times of trouble have a tendency to excite them: this very one revived amidst the throes that attended the Reformation, and was denounced in the Articles of King Edward. Still amidst the horrors of the persecutions of Nero and Severus, what wonder that men, who could find no resting-place on the earth they dwelt in, should have cherished visions of a better Jerusalem and a resurrection of the saints? For we have seen that by the time of Eusebius, *i. e.* when the Church was beginning to enjoy peace, the Millenarian doctrine was on the wane. And I will add that the same consideration will account for some other conclusions in the Fathers, which have been urged against their credit without due allowance; particularly the discouraging terms in which they sometimes speak of marriage—it was the "present distress" that in all probability sunk deep in their spirit and tinctured their thoughts—and no man can read the history, either of Rowland Taylor's martyrdom, or of Rogers', in our own country, without feeling how poignantly the surrender of wife and children, in their cases, must have added to the bitterness of death. But on this subject, I shall have occasion to speak again, and more at length.

[1] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 80.

[2] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 39.

LECTURE IX.

Second proposition of Daillé. His charges against the Fathers of inaccuracy, ignorance of Hebrew, use of allegory, examined. Important principle involved in the latter. Why it was so largely resorted to. Excessive use of it by Clemens and Origen. Doctrinal errors of the Fathers insufficient to overthrow their testimony. Daillé's instances of their discrepancies chiefly Post-Nicene. Discrepancies of the Ante-Nicene confined to minor points. Their concurrence in important ones the more striking. Concluding objection of Daillé. The appeal to the Fathers not excluded by the sixth Article. Discretion of our Church in her use of them. Scripture and antiquity the authorities appealed to by our Reformers.

WE have now reviewed the arguments of Daillé contained in his first book, in which he had endeavoured to establish his first proposition, that the testimony of the Fathers is obscure, uncertain, and therefore unfit to decide modern controversies.

His second book is occupied with proving his second proposition, viz. that even supposing the testimony of the Fathers was clearer, it is not of authority to decide such controversies. This book, however, will not detain us so long as the other, having been very much anticipated in the former one. Without staying, therefore, to debate such preliminary questions as that the Fathers are, like other men, liable to error[1]; that they have often a bias of their own towards this conclusion or that, which may mislead them in stating what they pretend to be the judgment of the Church[2]; that their authority must rest on the same ground as that of other teachers[3]; that we must not put them on the same footing as canonical Scripture[4];—dismissing, I say, such preliminary matters as these, and considering that they carry along with them their own answers, and only present another instance of those tactics in Daillé, which I have before had occasion to notice, viz. a disposition to create a prejudice before he proceeds to an argument, or else

[1] Daillé, p. 205. [2] p. 206. [3] p. 210. [4] p. 220.

satisfied that they have been already handled by us in former Lectures, we will go on to examine some of the *errors* which he imputes to them, and by which he reckons their authority to be subverted. It is impossible, he thinks, that parties who wrote with such incaution, carelessness, and negligence, could have regarded themselves as oracles whom we were to listen to.[1] And he then produces examples of some errors of *haste*. Here, however, as elsewhere, Daillé illustrates, for the most part, though not altogether, from the works of the Post-Nicene Fathers. Amongst the Ante-Nicene, there is reason to believe, as he states, that Origen dictated some of his Homilies off-hand; and of course the value of compositions, which were so little studied, must be taken accordingly. Extempore effusions, no doubt, would be poor authority for the doctrines of a Church either in Origen's days or our own. But how small a part of the Ante-Nicene Theology, at least, consists in Homilies. Not that the accuracy of the writers of that period, even in other departments, can in all respects be vindicated. Certainly there are gross mistakes to be found in them. Daillé produces several from Justin. He makes David, *e. g.* live 1500 years before Christ[2]; and when treating of the Septuagint version, says that Ptolemy, King of Egypt, sent messengers to Herod, King of Judæa, to beg of him copies of the writings of the Prophets; whereas he did send to Eleazar the High Priest, some 200 years before Herod's time.[3] He mentions a statue erected under Claudius Cæsar at Rome, to Simon Magus, with the inscription "Simoni Deo sancto,"[4] on which Daillé observes, that it is now agreed amongst learned men, that it was in truth a statue dedicated Semoni Sanco Deo, one of the minor Deities of Rome, and that Justin misread the legend—a fact, however, not quite so certain. For Justin himself was, like Simon, a native of Samaria, and would, therefore, be likely to make himself master of the particulars of Simon's history beyond another man. Moreover he addresses himself, when speaking of this statue, to the Emperor of Rome himself, who might be supposed, or at least must have had those about him who might be supposed, to be able to test the accuracy of the statement. The fragment of marble, too, dug up in the island of the Tiber, in the year 1574, inscribed Semoni Sanco Deo

[1] Daillé, p. 234.
[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 42.
[3] § 31. Daillé, p. 238.
[4] Daillé, p. 240.

Fidio, and the discovery of which, and nothing whatever else, gave occasion to calling Justin's account in question, has been thought by some to be too small to have ever had a statue upon it. And finally, Justin's story has been repeated by most of the early Fathers that followed him, nearly in the same terms[1]; so that it is at any rate far from clear that Justin, in this case, at least, was in error. Daillé further takes notice of his quoting Zephaniah for Zechariah,[2] and Jeremiah for Daniel.[3] He might have added that he cites Isaiah for Jeremiah,[4] and Zechariah for Malachi[5]; that he talks of the Prophets who foretold the coming of Christ some 5000, some 3000, some 2000, some 1000, some 800 years beforehand[6]; that he reads the same passage of Scripture in several ways, in several places[7]; and even yet he would not have exhausted his inaccuracies. Indeed, one of his editors,[8] losing patience with his author, exclaims in one of his notes, "Incredibilis est Justini in recitandis Scripturis inconstantia;" and in his Dedication talks of "Incredibilis quædam in scribendo festinatio" in Justin; and yet, in spite of all this, this very editor does not scruple to speak of him in the same Dedication as ætate antiquissimum, *auctoritate gravissimum*. And such, I am confident, would be the impression left on the mind of any man, who read him carefully through in a fair and candid spirit, and considered how accidental the greater part of these lapses are, and how very small a proportion, after all, they bear to the extent of his works. For this is what gives effect to Daillé's criticism in the whole of his second book, that ranging over the writings of the Fathers, he selects nothing whatever from them but their mistakes and defects; and having done this with an air of seeming triumph, he exclaims, these are the authors you are disposed to regard with reverence. What if a Romanist (to avail myself of an illustration of his own) were to collect together all the difficulties contained in the Bible, and then ask in his turn, Is this the book which you Protestants tell us he who runs may read? The inaccuracies of Justin are almost all of a kind that do not materially affect his credit as a witness of the Church of his own time,

[1] See Burton's Bampton Lectures, Notes, p. 374.
[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 35.
[3] § 51.
[4] § 53.
[5] Dial. § 49.
[6] Apol. I. § 31.
[7] Compare Apol. I. § 45; Dial. §§ 32. 83.
[8] Thirlby, p. 75.

whether as to its ordinances or doctrines. They are in general mere slips of memory, perhaps occurring when he was writing under difficulties, and without his references at hand. It is not unreasonable to suppose, that a man who lived in such a day, and who died a martyr's death, did not compose with all the advantages, which appertain to a quiet scholar in peaceful times with his books about him. Indeed, the Apologies bear internal evidence of having been written under persecution; and the Dialogue (if we are not to suppose the scene altogether imaginary) of the author having been on the eve of a voyage when he maintained it.

There is another class of errors on which Daillé animadverts, as shaking the authority of the Fathers—those which beset them through their ignorance of Hebrew—ignorance which he finds betrayed more particularly in their attempts at etymology.[1] Some instances he gives; many more he might have given. Thus Justin derives the word Satanas from Satan (*σατὰν*) an apostate, and nas (*νᾶς*) a serpent,[2] Israel from Isra (Ἰσρα), a man, and El (Ἦλ) power.[3] Irenæus says that in the Hebrew tongue Jesus signifies "that Lord who contains heaven and earth."[4] He has equally strange interpretations of Sabaoth and Adonai[5]; the former of which, he says, means "voluntarium," the latter "nominabile," or perhaps it should be read "innominabile," a substitute for the unutterable name, which Irenæus mistook for a word having the actual sense of "innominabile." Other stumbles of the same kind may be remarked in him. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us that Jacob was "called Israel because he had seen the Lord God,"[6] and that Moses was so called, because in the language of the Egyptians water is *μῶυ*,[7] and Hosanna means "light and glory and praise, with supplication to the Lord,"[8] and that Rebecca is equivalent to "patience" (*ὑπομονὴ*), where he speaks with Philo, from whom he very often borrows his derivations,[9] yet he else where says that it is equivalent to the "glory of God."[10] Theophilus of Antioch, who had an unhappy taste for etymology, seems to consider the Hebrew word Sabbath exactly translated

[1] Daillé, pp. 243, 244.
[2] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 103.
[3] § 125.
[4] Irenæus, II. c. xxiv. § 2.
[5] c. xxxv. § 3.
[6] Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. vii. p. 132.
[7] Stromat. I. § xxiii. p. 412.
[8] Pædag. I. c. v. pp. 104, 105.
[9] I. c. v. p. 111, and Stromat. I. § v. p. 334.
[10] Stromat. IV. § xxv. p. 637.

by the Greek word ἑβδομάς[1]; though certainly in his interpretation of the word Eden,[2] and of the word[3] Noah he is not liable to the same animadversion. There seems some reason to think, I will add, that even Origen, the single one of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, whose works have come down to us, supposed to have had much knowledge of Hebrew, had but a limited amount of it; for though his Hexapla proves that such as he had he turned to the best account, and though the loss of that work is, perhaps, the heaviest of any that biblical criticism ever sustained, still his writings yield incidental evidence that his acquaintance with Hebrew was not profound. Thus his correspondent Africanus having started an objection to the authority of the history of Susanna and the Elders, that it bore internal marks of not having been written in Hebrew—for that when one of the elders said he had seen Susanna in the act of adultery under a holm-tree (ὑπὸ πρῖνον), Daniel's answer was, that the angel would saw him asunder (πρίσειν); and when the other said under a mastic-tree (ὑπὸ σχῖνον), Daniel's answer again was, that he, too, would be cleft in twain (σχισθῆναι); the similarity of the Greek words πρῖνον and πρίσειν, σχῖνον and σχισθῆναι, suggesting the turn of the sentence, which similarity did not exist in the Hebrew[4]—Origen replies, that "Finding himself at a loss, he had referred the question to Jews not a few, asking them what πρῖνος was called in their language, and what πρίζειν, how they would translate the plant σχῖνος, and how they would render σχίζειν; and though they profess themselves unable to tell him what trees were indicated by these names, and so far Origen might seem not more imperfectly informed in Hebrew than themselves, seeing that what was a difficulty to him was a difficulty to them; yet, no doubt, these Jews could have readily given the meaning of πρίζειν and σχίζειν in the Hebrew, which Origen, it should appear, could not; and altogether his mode of putting the case argues that he had no confidence in his own judgment on this occasion, or in his possessing the means of forming one. Elsewhere he considers Sabaoth as in itself one of the names of God, and couples it with Adonai as another.[5] And it is remarkable that though the first two books against Celsus profess to be an answer to the objections of a Jew against

[1] Theophilus ad Autolycum, II. § 12.
[2] § 24.
[3] III. § 19.
[4] Origen, Ep. ad Africanum, § 6.
[5] Contra Celsum, I. § 25.

Christianity,[1] not a single argument in them turns upon the Hebrew or touches on it; and yet this work was written after the greater part of his Commentary on the books of Scripture, perhaps after the whole, except that on certain of the Prophets; so that we have here proof that the compositions which have come down to us were principally framed by Origen when his Hebrew scholarship was such as I have intimated.[2] But allowing that the early Fathers, with one or two exceptions, were ignorant of Hebrew, or at least imperfectly acquainted with it, that circumstance does not shake their authority as witnesses of the practices and doctrines of the Primitive Church. It may make them in themselves less able expositors of the Old Testament, but that is not the question. The value of the Primitive Fathers arises chiefly from this, that living soon after our Lord and the Apostles, soon after the times when the Holy Ghost was most active in the Church leading the disciples into all truth, and being themselves trusted by the Church with high offices, they can scarcely fail of reflecting in some considerable measure the impression which the Church had taken, and must in the main communicate the notions of doctrines to be taught and ordinances to be observed, not which they themselves had derived from their Hebrew or other scholarship, but which had been imparted to them from even a higher source.

Another feature in the writings of the Fathers, which Daillé produces as impairing their authority, is their heedless use of allegory.[3] Here, again, Daillé's instances are drawn as usual, from the works of Post-Nicene Fathers: but I have no wish to avail myself of that escape from his argument. The same taste exhibits itself in the Ante-Nicene authors so universally, that if any one thing more than another can be predicated of the Primitive Church, it is that in the explanation of Scripture, and especially of the Old Testament, it was governed by a principle of figurative interpretation: but it is

[1] Præfatio, § 6; II. § 77; III. § 1.

[2] The work against Celsus was written after the Commentary on Genesis (VI. § 49), after that on the Psalms (VII. § 31), after that on Isaiah and Ezekiel, and some of the twelve prophets (VII. § 11), after that on the Ep. to the Romans (V. § 47), and on the First Ep. to the Thessalonians (II. § 65).

[3] He says of them, "Scripturam in vanos fumos convertunt," p. 248; and again, "quos ille (Augustinus) *neglectâ literâ*, contortis allegoriis sæpe frigidis et dilutis, vexat verius quam interpretatur."—p. 250.

figurative interpretation for one object almost exclusively, viz. to show that the Scriptures from first to last, even in their most ordinary details, are filled with the subject of a Saviour. I shall have a better opportunity of pointing this out by examples at a future time, when I come to speak of the interpretation of Scripture, and of the cast given to it by a knowledge of the Fathers. At present I will content myself with saying, that this allegorical mode of understanding Scripture and the facts recorded in Scripture, however indulged in by the Fathers, and especially by the later Fathers to excess, is certainly in itself of the very earliest date in the Christian Church. For not to speak of the Epistle of Barnabas, written within forty years of our Saviour's death, which is full of it; the "senior quidam," to whom Irenæus refers from time to time (not always, perhaps, the same person, but necessarily contemporary or all but contemporary with the Apostles, indeed called on one occasion "senior apostolorum discipulus")[1] is clearly actuated by it; finding, as he does, in the extension of the arms of Jesus on the Cross, an emblem of the purpose of God to gather unto Himself two people, the Jews and the Gentiles.[2] So that the principle itself was no weakness in the Fathers, no hallucination of theirs, but, however used by them or even abused, was, as I have said, unquestionably a prominent feature of the theology of the Primitive Church, to which they merely gave expression. The tendency to this peculiar character of exposition in the early Church was augmented, as it should seem, by the reluctance observed in the Jews, at least with the exception of those of Alexandria and of the Alexandrian school, to discover in Scripture any meaning beyond the literal, (whereby they cut themselves off from much of the evidence it contained for a Saviour to come, and hardened themselves in unbelief,[3] nay, often involved the Law in positive contradictions, the language of it, when figuratively intended, not answering to a strictly literal sense,[4]) and was further augmented by a similar effect the same adherence to the literal sense was seen to produce on the Ebionites, (for they too disparaged the Saviour,) and by the manner in which it was perceived to pave the way for heretics in general to claim the authority of Scripture for doctrines the

[1] Irenæus, IV. c. xxxii. § 1.
[2] V. c. xvii. § 4.
[3] IV. c. xxvi. § 1.
[4] V. c. xxxiii. § 3.

most extravagant, (arguing, for example, as they did,[1] against the resurrection of the body from the text "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God,") and this not in a few instances, but in so many, that more heresies, it was said, might be referred to the process of expounding Scripture by the letter, than even to the lusts and passions of mankind.[2] Strong, however, as the appetite of the Fathers certainly was on all these accounts for figures, I do not think any instance can be produced from those before Origen of the literal meaning of a passage of Scripture being evaporated in the figurative. The Epistle of Barnabas, replete as it is with allegory, always betrays that its author regarded the incidents of the Law, on which he founds his figures, as matters of fact. With Justin it is the same. He may have his theory, for instance, of the battle of the Israelites with Amalek, and of the esoteric meaning it conveyed, but he evidently believes that the battle was fought, and was attended by the circumstances recorded in holy Writ.[3] Or he may find a deeper sense than the apparent one in the milch kine conveying the cart which contained the ark to the house of Joshua[4]; but he had no suspicion of the transaction itself being ideal.[5] Theophilus reviews all the details of the Creation as recorded by Moses, and detects a mystical sense under almost every one of them; but he still regards the whole as a substantial history, and rebukes the Greeks for the fabulous nature of their cosmogony.[6] Irenæus abounds in mystical applications of Scriptural incidents, but still he cannot justly be charged with resolving the fact into the figure. Take the history of Lot and his daughters, a history which he construes allegorically (or rather the Presbyter does so, whose words he adopts); and still it will be discovered, that he considers it as an actual event in that patriarch's life. And this, be it observed, belongs to a class of the most trying cases of all that I could have named; the offensive character of the act putting the commentator under a temptation to refine it into a parable. Still, I say, the transaction is quoted as a real occurrence. It is expressly

[1] Origen, De Princip. IV. § 22; Irenæus, V. c. xiii. § 2.

[2] Hæreses quoque magis de carnali scripturæ intelligentiâ, quam de opere carnis nostræ, ut plurimi æstimant.—Origen, Fragment., vol. i. p. 41, Bened. Ed. See also De Princip. IV. § 8.

[3] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 131.

[4] 1 Sam. vi. 14.

[5] Justin Martyr, Dial. §§ 132, 133.

[6] Theophilus ad Autol. II. §§ 11, 12.

branded as a sin; and we are invited to give God thanks for having provided a pardon for such sins of the patriarchs by the Advent of our Lord. Tertullian has his allegories, but not to the annihilation of the facts they grow out of. The wise men, when they offered Jesus gold, and frankincense, and myrrh, intimated that the curious arts of magic were all to be surrendered, now that the infant Saviour had appeared. And the command given them to return from Bethlehem by another way, was expressive of the better course in which they were to walk for the time to come.[1] But the journey of the wise men is considered to be a fact, for it is argued on as such in the self-same passage.

It is not till we come to Clemens Alexandrinus, that we have any misgivings whatever on the subject before us; or that our suspicions are awaked of the real being sunk in the allegorical. Alexandria, indeed, was the very focus of the figurative exposition of Scripture; under the influence of Philo the Alexandrian Jew, to whom Clemens refers, and from whom he largely borrows[2]; and of Aristobulus, a commentator on the books of Moses of a still earlier date, he also of Alexandria.[3] That Clemens finds mysteries in the incidents both of the Old Testament and of the New, in great abundance, and in very trivial matters, and refines on them to excess, is certain; but whether he ever actually loses sight of the letter in the spirit, may still be doubted; though it perhaps may be allowed that he does so write as to pave the way for Origen, who succeeded him in the same school, and who also was a great admirer of Philo, to do so in some instances; and he is the first of the Fathers, of whom it can be said that he refines the fact away in the allegory; and even of him it can only be said under great restriction. Origen's general notions upon this question seem to be most fairly represented in his treatise against Celsus, the soberest of his works—viz. that we are to consider the narrative of Scripture as having an obvious sense, but that we are not to rest in the obvious; nor in interpreting the Law are we to begin and end with the letter[4]—and that in like manner, in contemplating

[1] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. ix.
[2] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. c. v. p. 333.
[3] Origen, Contra Celsum, IV. § 51.
[4] "Ως μὴ καταπαύοντες τὸν νοῦν τῶν λεγομένων ἐν τῇ προφανεῖ ἱστορίᾳ, μήδ' ἐν τῇ κατὰ τὰς λέξεις καὶ τὸ γράμμα νομοθεσίᾳ.—Contra Celsum, II. § 6.

the incidents related of Jesus, we shall not arrive at the spectacle of the truth in full, unless we are guided by the same rule.[1]

Meanwhile it may be conceded to Daillé, that when the Fathers wrote in the unelaborate manner they did, they could have little idea that they were prescribing for our faith, or settling our controversies.[2] But they are not the worse qualified for exerting such influence on us, because they had no intention of doing so. We may not be disposed to acquiesce in the reasonableness of every allegory, which every Father discovers or thinks he discovers in Scripture. The Fathers themselves do not expect it. Origen expressly says, that though we may be sure a fact is typical, we cannot be sure that the type we see in it is the right one: we may suppose *e. g.* fearlessly, that the Tabernacle in general is figurative, but in applying the figure in detail we may be more or less mistaken.[3] But this general conclusion at least we may draw from testimony so concurrent, that the spirit of the Primitive Church in its interpretation, was to deal largely in allegories by which the text was made continually to point to the Saviour: or in other words, that an evangelical construction of Scripture was the construction sanctioned by the Primitive Church. And though the authority of the Fathers, as individual interpreters, might be damaged by any extravagance in an allegory, whilst they were in pursuit of this leading object; their authority as witnesses, that the interpretation of Scripture went very much upon that principle, would not suffer by it; nay, would be rather promoted. And this, we must always remember, is the matter at issue, what authority is due to the Fathers as witnesses of the character of the Primitive Church. A child may produce more conviction in the minds of a jury than the greatest wit, and certainly would do so, if his

[1] Τὰ συμβεβηκέναι ἀναγεγραμμένα τῷ Ἰησοῦ οὐκ ἐν ψιλῇ τῇ λέξει καὶ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τὴν πᾶσαν ἔχει θεωρίαν τῆς ἀληθείας.—Contra Celsum, II. § 69.

[2] Daillé, p. 251.

[3] Καὶ ὅτι μὲν οἰκονομίαι εἰσί τινες μυστικαὶ δηλούμεναι διὰ τῶν θείων γραφῶν, πάντες καὶ οἱ ἀκεραιότατοι τῶν τῷ λόγῳ προσιόντων πεπιστεύκασι· τίνες δὲ αὗται, οἱ εὐγνώμονες καὶ ἄτυφοι ὁμολογοῦσι μὴ εἰδέναι . . . . . ἐπὰν ἡ κατασκευὴ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀναγινώσκηται, πειθόμενοι τύπους εἶναι τὰ γεγραμμένα, ζητοῦσιν ἃ δυνήσονται ἐφαρμόσαι ἑκάστῳ τῶν κατὰ τὴν σκηνὴν λεγομένων· ὅσον μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ πείθεσθαι ὅτι τύπος τινός ἐστιν ἡ σκηνή, οὐ διαμαρτάνοντες· ὅσον δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ τῷδέ τινι ἀξίως τῆς γραφῆς ἐφαρμόζειν τὸν λόγον οὗ ἐστι τύπος ἡ σκηνή, ἔσθ' ὅτε ἀποπίπτοντες, κ.τ.λ.—Origen, De Principiis, IV. § 9.

position happened to give him advantages, which the other had not, for bearing testimony to the question in dispute. Besides there is another light in which these allegories should be regarded, as has been well observed by Dr. Waterland,[1] viz. that they were probably in most instances not so much intended to be *interpretations* of Scripture, as *uses* or *improvements* of it; pious *meditations* upon Scripture; spiritual exercises, calculated, perhaps, beyond any other lessons to attract attention and win the multitude of hearers. How popular are the Contemplations of Bishop Hall, which are of this character!

Another argument, by which Daillé detracts from the authority of the Fathers is, that in many particulars of their faith they were in acknowledged error.[2] And then he briefly recounts a list of charges of this kind, which he thinks might be brought against them. Justin believed in the Millennium; regarded, as it should seem, the essence of the Deity to be finite (a view which Daillé imputes to him on very insufficient grounds, and by a technical construction of a loose phraseology, never intended to be taken literally[3]); understood by the sons of God going in unto the daughters of men, an intercourse of fallen angels with women, of which demons were the issue; imagined that the souls even of the just and of the prophets in the intermediate state, fell under some power of the evil spirits, building his notion (a circumstance which Daillé suppresses, though it qualifies his proposition) partly on the capacity the witch enjoyed of calling up the soul of Samuel[4]; thought that the heathens such as Socrates, who lived up to their reason, (μετὰ λόγου, the double sense of λόγος being, no doubt, at the bottom of his argument[5]) were in some sort Christians. Irenæus, besides partaking with Justin in some of these errors, contended that our Lord was between forty and fifty years of age when he died; led into this mistake partly, perhaps (as Augustine suspects[6]), by his ignorance of

[1] On the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity. Works, vol. v. p. 312. Oxf. Ed.

[2] Daillé, p. 252.

[3] Daillé, p. 255. Justin is employed in convincing Trypho, that he is wrong in supposing all that is said of "the Lord" in the Old Testament appertains to God the Father—*e. g.* "The Lord rained down fire from the Lord" would imply that God the Father was not himself in heaven at that time, but at Sodom, if it was the God the *Father*, who was there; Justin's object being to force on Trypho a recognition of God the Son.—Dial. §§ 60. 127.

[4] § 105.

[5] Apol. I. § 46.

[6] See Dissert. Prævv. p. cxxxviii. Bened. Ed.

the years of the Consulate, in which Christ was born and suffered, and partly by his eagerness to repel the argument of the Gnostics, who found a type of their thirty Æons in the age at which they maintained Christ was crucified, seeing that he began to be about thirty years of age when he was baptized, *i. e.* in their reckoning twenty-nine, and that his teaching lasted twelve months only (the number of another group of their Æons) being the period which was announced for it before by the prophet, when he spake of the "acceptable year of the Lord." Irenæus, therefore, not content with showing, as he does, that Christ's ministry must have extended beyond one year by the fact of his attending at least three Passovers, further impugns their claim to the symbol of thirty years by lengthening the life of Jesus to more than forty, relying upon the reasoning that he had to sanctify every age of man by the corresponding one of his own: infants, by his infancy; boys, by his boyhood; men, by his maturity; and old men, by his incipient decay; upon the text, "Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?"[1] and upon the tradition of the elders from St. John. Irenæus also maintains that disembodied souls retain the form of the bodies they occupied, so that they may still be recognised, as the soul of Lazarus was by the rich man.[2] Again, Clemens Alexandrinus teaches that the Gentiles were in some sort justified by philosophy[3]; meaning, however, no more than that the virtue there was in it, and which was itself supplied by God, trained them for a better faith, as the Law did the Jews; that those who lived before the Advent of the Saviour, could not be justly condemned if they had no option with respect to accepting or rejecting his message; and that therefore, after the crucifixion, he descended into Hades to publish to them the Gospel and its conditions[4]; and that punishments are purgatorial, and therefore not eternal.

Daillé proceeds through the other Fathers in the same way, but I shall not follow him, having now produced a number of specimens of the class of errors into which the Fathers are in the habit of falling, to give you a just idea of them, and to satisfy you that they are not of a kind to invalidate the authority of those writers as witnesses to the great character-

[1] Irenæus, II. c. xxii.
[2] c. xxxiv. § 1.
[3] Stromat. I. § xx. p. 377.
[4] VI. § vi. p. 763, *et seq.*

istics of the Primitive Church, both with regard to its doctrines and ritual. If we had pretended that the Fathers were infallible, it would have been another thing, but we made no such claims for them. These errors, you will have seen, are almost all of them private conjectures on speculative points of subordinate importance, which do not affect any of the great doctrines of Christianity, for on such all these parties are agreed. It may be a chronological blunder to contend that our Lord was between forty and fifty when he was crucified, but that is all that can be said. It would have been a vital matter to have disputed his crucifixion in the flesh at all, the circumstance that made it availing, the union of the Godhead and Manhood in the Person of the Saviour, and the redemption it wrought for the sins of the whole world; but in these latter positions they are of one consent, and by their unanimity afford us all reasonable assurance that the Primitive Church was agreed on them too. So far from fundamental are the questions here agitated, that it may be doubted whether our own Church, with all her formularies and Articles, would touch the case of one who held any or all of them, so as to exclude him from her communion. When the early Fathers wrote, which was before successive ages, each profiting by the labours of those before it, had sifted theology, before Councils of the Church had been assembled, and before nice and exact Confessions of faith had been framed—all these measures, be it remembered, proceeding upon the principle not of devising what was new, but of determining and fixing what was taught, though not technically expressed, from the beginning—when the early Fathers wrote, I say, before all this investigation into the details of Divinity had occurred, there must have been many lesser points unsettled, and great room for the fancies of individuals dispersed over the world, with not much opportunity of personal conference and with no rail to hold by, to wander into peculiar thoughts. And this consideration only gives greater value to their testimony when it is unanimous, as on all main things it is, and tends even to raise their authority on the subjects for which we use it.

The next circumstance which Daillé represents as invalidating the *authority* of the Fathers, is their disagreement one with another; the old story, in short, of Father against Father. But what are these discrepancies which are supposed to be so

fatal to the credit of the Fathers? None are specified of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, at least one with another, save the tales of Victor's controversy with the Asiatics on the time of keeping Easter, and Cyprian's with Stephanus on the subject of Baptism of heretics,[1] unless it be that other respecting the age of Jesus at his crucifixion, in which Irenæus disagrees with Tertullian[2]; and that still more minute one respecting the soul of Samuel, which Justin represents as really called up by the witch[3]; whilst Tertullian regards it as merely a spectral illusion.[4] The other instances adduced by Daillé are those of Ante-Nicene Fathers differing from Post-Nicene, as Tertullian from Augustine on the nature of the soul's generation, which is nearly the only one of this class; for another of fasting on Saturday, in which Ignatius is described as opposed to the Apostolical Constitutions, is a spurious case, the Epistle of Ignatius to the Philippians, on which it is founded, being, as we have already observed, apocryphal[5]: or of Post-Nicene Fathers, and many of those of quite a late date, differing from one another. With such cases as these I am not careful to engage; the testimony of the Fathers becoming less interesting, and our anxiety to defend it less sensitive in proportion as they are removed from primitive times, and from the Church of which we seek to ascertain the features. But how few and how unimportant are the discrepancies between the Ante-Nicene Fathers, is evident from the perpetual recurrence we find, in the detractors from their worth, of these two cases of the Paschal and Baptismal controversy. These are always put forward as their greatest grievances, as the foremost criminations under this head of which they can bethink themselves. Yet how far from being matters of primary importance are these! And if the peace of the Church was disturbed to the degree in which it *was* disturbed, by two such contests as these, both of them springing out of extreme jealousy of *innovation*, and a determination on either side to adhere to what either party considered to be a primitive usage, how certain may we be that the same persons would not have submitted to any unsound compromise on matters more serious; and how safely may we conclude, that if on such matters they are unanimous, their unanimity is the result of their confidence, that the faith

[1] Daillé, p. 296. [2] p. 297. [3] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 105. [4] Tertullian, De Animâ, c. lvii. [5] Daillé, p. 297.

they hold in those particulars was that once delivered to the saints!

Finally, Daillé contends that even supposing the Fathers to be not so *obscure* as they are, and to deserve more *authority* than they have, neither Romanists nor Protestants do acknowledge them as umpires in their disputes, but accept and reject them at pleasure, and in a degree which suits their own convenience. Thus Protestants admit nothing but the canonical Scriptures as their rule of faith, this dogma being the very corner-stone of the Reformation[1]; and in confirmation of the fact, he cites Calvin, Bucer, Melancthon, Luther, Beza, though admitting that the chief among them (and the name of Jewel he here introduces) did refer to the books of the Fathers in their disputations. But it will be found, says he, on an accurate examination of their manner of reasoning, that they used them not to establish their own opinions, but to refute those of the Romanists.[2] I think he would have a difficulty in proving this in the case of Jewel at least. In the beginning of his Apology he proposes to make the works of the Fathers an *element* of his demonstration, that the Reformers had right on their side. "Quod si docemus sacrosanctum Dei Evangelium, et veteres episcopos, atque Ecclesiam primitivam nobiscum facere,"[3] is the language which he uses; not simply is against the Romanists, but *nobiscum facere*, is with us; and the whole tenour of his argument is consistent with this exposition of it. Nor does the sixth Article of our Church, which is of much more consequence, speak to the exclusion of all respect for the decisions of the Primitive Church in the manner Daillé understands this maxim of the Reformation; and as his reference to Jewel indicates that he involves the Church of England in this observation, it is proper for us to appeal to the authoritative documents of that Church. There is nothing in that Article which is not perfectly consistent with what we are pleading for. "We allow no doctrine as *necessary*," to use the words of one of the soundest of our divines, Dr. Waterland, "which stands only on *Fathers* or on *tradition*, oral or written; we admit none

[1] Daillé, p. 306.

[2] Sed si eorum mentem atque institutum accuratè inspexeris, reperies eos ad refutandum non ad confirmandum, ad evertendas opiniones Romanas, non ad suas constituendas Patrum uti testimonio.—Daillé, p. 310.

[3] Bishop Jewel's Works, vol. iv. p. 12, Oxf. Ed.

for such, but what is *contained* in Scripture, and *proved* by Scripture, *rightly* interpreted. And we know of no way more safe in *necessaries*, to preserve the *right* interpretation, than to take the *ancients* along with us. We think it a good method to secure our *rule of faith* against impostures of all kinds, whether of *enthusiasm* or false *criticism*, or *conceited* reason, or *oral* tradition, or the assuming dictates of an *infallible* chair. If we thus preserve the true sense of Scripture, and upon that sense build our faith, we then build upon Scripture *only*; for the sense of Scripture is Scripture. Suppose a man were to prove his legal title to an estate, he appeals to the *laws*; the true sense and meaning of the laws must be proved by the best rules of interpretation; but after all it is the *law* that gives the title, and that *only*. In like manner, after using all proper means to come at the *sense* of Scripture (which is Scripture), it is that and that only, which we *ground* our faith upon, and *prove* our faith by. We allege not Fathers as *grounds*, or *principles*, or *foundations* of our faith, but as witnesses, and as interpreters, and faithful conveyers."[1] That is the aspect in which the Church of England contemplates the early Fathers. And if the Church of Rome does not hold them in equal honour,—and the numerous examples which Daillé adduces of this in the person of Petau (Petavius), and other Jesuits, tend to show that it does not,—this should only lead us to conclude that their testimony is not lightly to be thrown away by those who would successfully contend with the Church of Rome. For what can have created this distaste for them in the minds of Romanists, but consciousness that they bore witness against them? And we know, in fact, what I have often suggested before, that Bishop Bull, in his defence of the Nicene Creed, is as much engaged in upholding the authority of the primitive Fathers against this same Jesuit Petau, as he is in maintaining it against Zuicker a Socinian, or Sandius an Arian.[2] Indeed, it is precisely the same feeling which prompts the Romanists to disparage the primitive Fathers, that prompts Daillé and the foreign Protestants to do the same; viz. that their authority is unpropitious to them both.

[1] Waterland, On The Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity.—Works, vol. v. p. 316, Oxf. Ed.

[2] Works of Bishop Bull, vol. i. p. 258, Oxf. Ed., and Def. Fid. Nic. sect. 2, c. iv. § 9.

It is true that our Church exercises a certain discretion in the use of the Fathers: some rites or doctrines she may not adopt, because she may think they have only the partial support of primitive testimony; such as Infant Communion, which rests, as we have seen, on a single witness, and that of the third century. Some, however innocent in themselves, she may reject, because she finds no trace of them in Scripture; such as the use of oil, milk and honey at or after Baptism, or of water with the wine in the Eucharist; whereas in most cases, where she follows the Fathers, she sees in them the development of some hint at least in Scripture. Some she qualifies from an experience that they have been the parents of dangerous superstitions; such as the invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements in the Eucharist, or ἐπίκλησις, as it is called, a primitive feature, which, though once distinctly forming a part of her Communion office, and though the parallel prayer is still retained in the office of Baptism for consecrating the water where there could be no abuse, she has not indeed *withdrawn* out of fear of encouraging the error of Transubstantiation, but modified by using the terms, "Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech Thee, and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood;" such, again, as prayers and offerings for the dead, another primitive custom which she has reduced in her Communion office to a thanksgiving for those that are departed in the faith and fear of God, and a prayer that "with them we may be partakers of God's heavenly kingdom;" not venturing to go further in that office more especially, remembering the masses for the dead of old; but in the Burial Service praying "that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of God's holy Name, may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul."

I adduce these instances as furnishing an idea of the manner in which the Church of England exercises a judgment of her own in handling the Fathers; now and then, for reasons I have said, walking with them delicately; in general, where their evidence is clear and unanimous, and especially where it responds to some intimation in Scripture otherwise scarcely

intelligible from its brevity, greatly resting upon it. The questions of Infant Baptism, sponsors at Baptism, promises at Baptism, a confession of faith at Baptism; the precise nature of the Eucharist, whether in any sense sacrificial or not, whether to be partaken of in both kinds and by all; a Clergy, whether an order distinct from the Laity, whether distinguished into three ranks; a form of Common Prayer in a language understood by the people; the Apostolical succession, the virtues of absolution, the character of schism—all these are subjects which enter into the composition of the Church of England, and are to be resolved more or less by *antiquity*. Accordingly, to enumerate them, is enough to point out the expediency of abiding by the watch-word of the best champions of our form of faith, and of upholding what it has been the great object of these Lectures to assert—Scripture and the Primitive Church. For we may be quite sure that if the Reformers drew their conclusions from these *two* premises, we shall not be able to defend those conclusions, if we repudiate one of them.

LECTURE X.

Occasion of Barbeyrac's work. His imperfect acquaintance with the Fathers, and misconstruction of their writings. His charge against Justin, that he encouraged volunteering martyrdom, examined. Sentiments of Clemens, Tertullian, Origen, Cyprian, on this subject. Warmth of their language accounted for. Martyrdom instrumental in the establishment of Christianity. Language of the Fathers concerning marriage explained by the circumstances of their times. True view of the case given by Tertullian in his treatise Ad Uxorem. Extravagances of later times not chargeable on the early Fathers.

THE work which, next to that of Daillé, has produced an unfavourable impression of the Fathers on the minds of a great number of persons, is Barbeyrac's "On the Morality of the Fathers."[1] And to complete my review of the objections which have been brought against these authors, I shall now bestow a short notice upon that treatise. This was originally an incidental attack upon them, made by a Professor of Law at Groningen in the course of a Preface which he wrote to Puffendorf's "Right of Nature and Nations." This Preface, so far as it related to the Fathers, was replied to by Ceillier, a French Benedictine; and Barbeyrac, finding a rejoinder to Ceillier, which he set himself to compose, grow too bulky to be included in a new edition of his Puffendorf, published it as an independent essay, with the title I have given. It will be perceived, therefore, that the treatise originated under jurisprudential rather than ecclesiastical auspices. Moreover, it seems very doubtful whether its author had carefully read the Fathers, on whose morality it comments; or had his mind imbued with the spirit, which the actual perusal of them would have left on it. Indeed the review of them which he

[1] Traité de la Morale des Pères de l'Eglise: où en défendant un article de la Préface sur Puffendorf, contre l'Apologie de la Morale des Pères du P. Ceillier, religieux Bénédictin de la Congregation de St. Vanne et de St. Hydulphe, on fait diverses réflexions sur plusieurs matières importantes. Par Jean Barbeyrac, Professeur en Droit à Groningue, et Membre de la Société Royale des Sciences à Berlin. Amsterdam, 1728.

takes, extending over the first six centuries, renders it impossible that he should have mastered all the Fathers on his list; or should have known more of many of them than he could get at second hand from indexes, abridgments, and extracts, which others might have furnished him with. Moreover, on his antagonist accusing him of having stolen from Daillé's treatise, and from the Bibliothèque Universelle, Barbeyrac's answer is, "Why does he not add M. Dupin, Usher, Bayle, Bernard, Claude, La Placette, Buddeus, Noodt, the Abbé Fleury, Grabe, La Croze, and others, whom I quote, some more, some less often? Why does he not produce my own declaration in the Preface, that 'I had purposely chosen such examples as have been advanced before, and are found cited in very common books?'"[1] And, in fact, on one occasion, he pleads guilty to having been misled by M. Dupin, on whose authority he had relied, to charge Athenagoras wrongfully with teaching the worship of angels[2]—a confession which may also perhaps lead us of ourselves to conclude that he had not examined for himself Justin any more than Athenagoras; for the passage in Justin, which is singularly parallel to this one cited from Athenagoras, on the same subject, the worship of angels, would, in fact, have offered him very much more plausible reasons for laying that error to the account at least of Justin (and for Barbeyrac's argument it was quite immaterial which of the two was the culprit[3]), the Romanists having positively laid claim to the paragraph as teaching this doctrine; and though Bishop Bull and other Protestant scholars have successfully resisted their claim to it, yet certainly the Romanists have more to say for themselves in this instance than they often have when referring to antiquity. The place, however, in Justin is so well known, and is so notorious a bone of contention between the two parties, that it is not likely it should have escaped the notice of Barbeyrac (for it does escape it, both when he is speaking of Athenagoras here, and afterwards when animadverting on the defective morality of Justin), had he ever read Justin's works for himself; and it is in relation to this conclusion that I advert to it. Again, from the way in which he asserts dogmatically and of himself, that St. Paul was reprobating the

[1] Barbeyrac, p. 11. [2] p. 25. [3] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 6.

allegorical spirit adopted by the Fathers[1] from the Jews, when he cautioned Timothy against giving "heed to fables and endless genealogies,"[2] he would seem to be unconscious of the text being usually applied to the system of Æons of the Gnostic heretics, which Irenæus is engaged in exposing, and that Irenæus himself so understands it, claiming it in that sense in his very first paragraph,[3] as he does elsewhere in his work—I say, from the way in which Barbeyrac overlooks all this, it might seem that he was not conversant with the writings of Irenæus, however he might collect together a few paragraphs from him, which furnished the ground of his objection; which, however, in that Father are extremely few. Again, from his manner of speaking of Clemens Alexandrinus, I should be disposed to draw the same inference, viz. that he had not made himself thoroughly acquainted with his works from his own perusal of them. Thus Barbeyrac gives an analysis of the Pædagogue of Clemens, and then concludes, "Now let them show me in this Pædagogue a single virtue of which Clemens has explained the nature and office in such a manner and to such an extent as to enlighten, to convince, to touch, in a word, to put a man in a condition to practise it as he ought. Let them point out to me a single duty, which is there set on its right foundation and developed as it should be."[4] But what could be more foreign to the purport of Clemens' work than to do this? In his Hortatory Address he had converted his heathen. In his Pædagogue he initiates his new convert into the practical effects which his conversion to Christianity must have on him in all the details, even the most ordinary, of his daily life. And no doubt it was a matter of the first importance, that a strong line of distinction like this should be drawn between the Christian and the Pagan. A person imbued with the writings of Clemens could scarcely have raised against him such an objection as this of Barbeyrac's.[5] Again, Barbeyrac would have found nothing extraordinary in Clemens making his Gnostic a Stoic by exempting him from all passions,[6] and yet at other times denouncing the Stoics as holders of impious opinions[7]; nor would have seen any contradiction in this for his admirers to reconcile; had he been aware from the perusal

[1] Barbeyrac, p. 98. [2] 1 Tim. i. 4.
[3] Irenæus, Præf. ad Lib. I.
[4] Barbeyrac, p. 53.
[5] See Bishop Kaye. Clemens, p. 110.
[6] Barbeyrac, p. 62.
[7] pp. 63, 64.

of his writings, that Clemens himself over and over again professes his own attachment to an *eclectic* philosophy; a philosophy which enabled him to pick and choose out of all the schools whatever he found to be good in any; holding that whatever was so, was dispersed amongst them by the dispensation of God, from whom all good emanates; and who was thus sowing the world with good principles, which were by degrees to be ripened into a perfect knowledge of his will through direct revelation.[1] Much other internal evidence of the proposition, for which I am contending, viz. that Barbeyrac had taken his information at second hand, and was not master of his authors, will transpire in the course of my remarks on his treatise. I dwell on it in the first instance, because it seems to me to be the key by which the argument of his book is almost always to be turned. He disputes on abstract principles without any allowance for, or, apparently, any sufficient knowledge of the accidents, which were necessarily to be taken into account in the application of them to the writings of the Fathers. Yet what is consistent with morality under certain circumstances, is not so under others. An act that would be wrong in the way of aggression is right in the way of self-defence. David and his men would not have been justified in eating the shewbread under ordinary circumstances, but under the pressure of hunger they were so. St. Paul would not have done well to cast the wheat into the sea, had he been sailing in smooth water; but when the tempest put men's lives in danger, he was right in doing so.[2] Accordingly, in judging of the morality of the Fathers, before we pronounce our verdict we must know their position. There is no evidence that Barbeyrac had properly acquainted himself with this; rather, evidence that he had not; and it may be presumed that much of the unfairness with which he treats them, is imputable to that cause.

I shall not think it necessary to follow him through the instances he gives of what he considers to be defective morality in the Fathers, according to the order in which he states them, but produce them, as may be most convenient for the illustration of the proposition I have just laid down. And, indeed, many of them seem to be rather cases of misunderstanding

[1] See Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. c. vii. p. 338, *et alibi*.
[2] Hooker, Eccl. Polity, V. c. ix. § 1.

of Scripture, or errors of judgment, than evidences of bad morality. For example, Irenæus may have given very weak reasons for there being four Gospels, and only four (though, weak as the reasons are, we are very thankful for this early testimony of the fact itself). But how can it serve the purpose of Barbeyrac, who alludes to it, p. 20; his business professing to be with the morality of the Fathers? So again, numerous allegories, particularly those of Origen, might be adduced by Barbeyrac in proof, if he pleased, of want of judgment in the Fathers; but they can scarcely be used by him, as they are,[1] in evidence of their bad morality without great straining of the argument.

I will first advert, then, to the accusation he brings against Justin, and eventually, indeed, against other Fathers, of encouraging in the Christians a disposition to volunteer martyrdom. "Lest any one should say," writes Justin,[2] "away, then, with you all, and put yourselves to death, and go to God, and do not give us the trouble. I will tell you why we do not do this; and why, when we are questioned, we boldly confess that we are Christians. We have been taught that God did not make the world to no purpose, but for the sake of the human race, and we have already said that he has pleasure in those who imitate his attributes, and is displeased with those who embrace what is wicked, whether in word or deed. If, then, we should all destroy ourselves, we should be the cause, as far as in us lies, of preventing any from being born, or from learning the Divine doctrines, or should even stop the existence of the race of man, herein acting contrary to the will of God. No, being questioned we do not deny, being conscious of nothing wrong, and accounting it impious not to tell the truth in all things, for this we know to be acceptable to God." Here, says Barbeyrac, Justin, so far from expressing any disapproval of the act of self-immolation, rather may seem to commend it.[3] But had he considered the circumstances which gave occasion to these reflections of Justin, he would have found that his censure is misplaced. Justin had been calling the attention of the Roman Emperors to the sufferings the Christians had been undergoing at Rome at the hands of Urbicus. He states the case of a woman, her-

[1] Barbeyrac, p. 103. [2] Justin Martyr, Apol. II. § 4. [3] Barbeyrac, p. 18.

self a convert to Christianity, who had a wicked and sottish husband. She wished to separate from him, but was dissuaded for a time by her friends. Eventually, however, she procured a divorce and released herself from him. He then denounced her as a Christian. She appealed to the Emperor; and whilst the appeal was pending, was safe. He then turned his attack upon Ptolemy, her teacher. Through a friend of Ptolemy's he got at a confession of his own, that he was a Christian; and on Urbicus charging Ptolemy with the fact he did not deny it. Accordingly Urbicus ordered him away to punishment. Whereupon one Lucius presumed to ask Urbicus, how he could let thieves, adulterers, and murderers go free, whilst he proceeded so severely with a man who bore the name of Christian. Thou, too, art one of them, was the reply of Urbicus. Yes, was the answer; and he was condemned.[1] It is clear, therefore, that the confession of Lucius was made in a moment of indignation, and that he had no deliberate intention of inviting martyrdom, but that being directly charged with being a Christian, he admitted that a Christian he was; whilst Justin, having affirmed the unlawfulness of suicide, affirms further the unlawfulness of saving life by telling a lie; so far justifying Lucius, as he elsewhere does the Christians in general when reduced to that alternative; and abjuring the evasion,

ἡ γλῶσσ' ὀμώμοκεν, ἡ δὲ φρὴν ἀνώμοτος.[2]

Would M. Barbeyrac have found better morality in a different course? Here we see the circumstances of the case entirely alter the complexion of Barbeyrac's argument. Nor, indeed, is there in the Fathers that blind sanction of the merit of martyrdom which has been sometimes ascribed to them. Certainly some strong passages in admiration of the martyrs may be occasionally met with in them; excused, perhaps, if not defended, by considerations which I will offer by and by. But the language of Clemens Alexandrinus is this, "When the Lord says, when they persecute you in one city, flee into another, he does not encourage us to fly from persecution as though it were an evil; neither does he command us to escape it by flight, as if we were fearful of death; but he wishes us not to be the cause, sole or concurrent, of ill to any man,

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. II. § 2. [2] I. § 39.

whether to ourselves, or to the persecutor and murderer. For in some sort he proclaims that we must take care of ourselves; and he who is disobedient (to this precept) is rash and foolhardy: and if he who slays man, who is God's (property), sins against God; so he who offers himself to the tribunal is accounted guilty of slaying man (viz. himself); and such an one would he be, who does not avoid persecution, but allows himself to be taken, out of mere bravado."[1] And again, still more explicitly, "A man is not a Gnostic" (a perfect Christian, in Clemens' sense) "merely because he possesses blind courage; for children are bold through mere ignorance, and will, for instance, touch fire; and wild beasts will rush against a spear. . . . He who is truly brave, when brought into manifest danger through the malignity of the multitude, takes with a good courage whatever befalls him: herein differing from others called *martyrs*, inasmuch as these make the occasion for themselves, throwing themselves into danger's way, I know not how, for we do not wish to speak harshly of them; whereas he taking care of himself, as reason directs, in the first instance, afterwards when God really calls him, gives himself up freely, and confirms the call, conscious that he has not been precipitate on his own part, and plays the man ready to be tested in that fortitude which is according to truth."[2] In Tertullian we find several passages to the same effect: one in the Apology,[3] "Why do you complain that we persecute you," is the taunt put into the mouth of the oppressors of the Christians, "if it is your pleasure to suffer? Certainly we are willing to suffer," is the reply, "but after the fashion of one engaged in war, who does not delight in the danger he is running, but nevertheless fights with all his might; and if he conquers, rejoices in the battle, which has brought him glory and spoil, howbeit he liked it not beforehand:" another in the De Coronâ, where Tertullian, having himself become a Montanist, is sneering at this very *moderation* as characteristic of the Church; and which, therefore, was once his own.[4] "Sentence," says he, "is passed on him, (*i. e.* on this refractory soldier who would not wear the wreath,) whether by Christians or heathens, I know not, for they would not differ, as on a foolhardy person, who by his scruples was troubling the

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. IV. c. x.
[2] VII. c. xi. p. 871.
[3] Tertullian, Apol. c. l.
[4] De Coronâ, c. i.

Christian name;" and in his De Idololatriâ,[1] he intimates in the same manner that many (multi) Christians were of opinion that no man should volunteer to produce himself. Origen, though more unguarded in his language, in one of his treatises at least, on the subject of martyrdom and its merits than any of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, still administers the same caution to those who would needlessly court it. In commenting on John xi. 54, "Jesus, therefore, walked no more openly among the Jews, but went thence into a country near to the wilderness, into a city called Ephraim, and there continued with his disciples," he expresses himself as follows: "This and the like, I suppose, was left on record, because the Word wished to divert us from rushing wildly and unreasonably on a trial to the death for the truth and on martyrdom. For though it is well that one who happens to encounter the trial for the confession of Jesus should not shrink from such confession, nor hesitate to die for the truth, it is no less well that he should not give occasion for any such temptation, but by every means avoid it, not only because the issue of it as regards himself is uncertain, but in order that we may not be the cause of others becoming more wicked who may not actually be guilty of shedding our blood, if we do our best to get out of the way of those who are plotting against our lives, but who would suffer the heavier punishment on our account, if, through self-conceit and a want of consideration for them, we give ourselves up to be slain without any urgent necessity."[2] In Cyprian we have still the same language: "Meanwhile, brethren, do ye according to the discipline in which ye have been instructed by me, and agreeably to the Lord's precepts, keep quiet; nor let any among you stir up any commotion amongst the brethren, neither *offer himself to the Gentiles of his own accord.* For his turn to speak is when he has been apprehended and delivered up. Since in that hour the Lord who is in us will speak, and who would rather that we should *confess* than *profess*."[3] And, again, in his treatise De Lapsis: "Therefore the Lord hath commanded us to *flee in persecution*, instructing us so to do by word and by example. For since the crown (of martyrdom?) descends by the favour of God, and cannot be received unless the hour for wearing it is come, whosoever with-

[1] De Idololatriâ, c. xxii.
[2] Origen, Comment. in Joannem, vol. iv. p. 397, Benedict. Ed.
[3] Cyprian, Ep. lxxxiii.

draws himself meanwhile, still, however, abiding in Christ, does not renounce his faith, but only awaits his turn."[1] Moreover, Cyprian sets an example in his own person of declining for a season instead of courting the martyr's lot; removing from Carthage, when persecution was at hand[2]; writing directions to his clergy from his place of concealment[3]; waiting to be informed when it is safe to return[4]; and continuing in his retreat more than two years.[5] Not to say that numerous *Apologies* composed by the Fathers bespeak the same moderation, the very object of them being, by explaining the real tenets of the Christians, and clearing them of the calumnies under which they suffered, to propitiate the magistrates towards them, and abate persecution. There can be no doubt, therefore, that they were as well aware of the duty of not throwing away their lives without a reason, as M. Barbeyrac himself is.

Why then, it may be asked, do we meet in them with so many extravagant eulogies of the virtue of the martyr: so many expressions in them, which would seem to inflame his zeal: and which lay them open to the censure of this critic of morals? Why do we hear Tertullian, *e. g.*, the same Tertullian, exultingly exclaim, "We struggle against all your cruelty, even *volunteering* to present ourselves; and better pleased when we are condemned than when we are acquitted?"[6] And again, "Be it far from us to take as a hardship those things which we desire to suffer."[7] Why do we hear him represent martyrdom again and again as a second Baptism, secunda intinctio,[8] secundum lavacrum[9]? Why have we Origen, the same Origen, in his Exhortatio ad Martyrium, as the tract is called by a title likely to mislead, for it is no general exhortation to martyrdom, but an address to two Christians, one of them a man of fortune[10] and conspicuous character in the Church, perhaps, too, a Presbyter; the other certainly one[11]; encouraging them to stand fast in a persecution that had actually overtaken them? Why, I say, have we Origen calling martyrdom "the cup of salvation,"[12] "the Baptism of martyr-

[1] Cyprian, De Lapsis, § x.
[2] Ep. ii. [3] Ep. xii.
[4] Ep. xxxvi. [5] Ep. xl.
[6] Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, c. i.
[7] c. ii. [8] De Patientiâ, c. xiii.
[9] De Baptismo, c. xvi.
[10] Origen, Exhort. ad Martyr. § 14.
[11] Ambrosius is called ἱερὸς by Origen, § 36, and θεοπρεπέστατος, § 1; and Protoctetus is expressly called πρεσβύτερος by Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 28.
[12] Exhort. ad Martyr. § 27.

dom," which cleanses the sufferer,[1] the act which places him near the altar of heaven, and so fits him like the priests of old for ministering remission of sins[2]; nay, by a still bolder flight (for I do not wish to keep anything back) which makes his blood, as the blood of the victims under the Law, precious in God's sight to the redemption of others; the martyr regarded as the ram, efficacious through Christ[3]? And why have we Cyprian, the same Cyprian, using phraseology no less emphatic, describing it as the most glorious Baptism of blood[4]; and elsewhere saying in terms evidently loose and rhetorical, but still to our purpose,[5] "Let us also, who, by God's permission, have administered Baptism to believers, prepare each and all of them for another Baptism, teaching them that this latter Baptism is greater in grace, more sublime in efficacy, more precious in honour; the Baptism with which the angels baptize; the Baptism in which God and his Christ rejoice; the Baptism after which no one sins again; the Baptism which consummates the growth of our faith; the Baptism which unites us at once, as we depart from the world, unto God. In the Baptism of water is received the remission of sins; in the Baptism of blood the crown of virtue. It is a thing to be desired and sought for in all our prayers and petitions, that being the servants of God we may become his friends." And other passages might be found in him equally strong—whence, I say, comes it, that the same parties, who, as we have seen, were quite alive to the immorality of rushing headlong upon martyrdom, should have still used expressions such as these, which expose them to Barbeyrac's strictures? Doubtless, they did not forget the language of Scripture on this exciting subject—our Lord's words, "Can ye be baptized with the Baptism that I am baptized with"—words to which much of the language I have quoted may be referred[6]—the encouragement addressed to the angel of the Church of Smyrna in the Revelation, "Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life"—the testimony borne in the same book, that "the souls of those who had been slain for the Word of God" were seen "under the altar"[7]—the high-spirited remonstrance

[1] Exhort. ad Martyr. § 30. [2] Ibid.
[3] Compare § 50, and Homil. xxiv. in Numeros, vol. ii. p. 362.
[4] Cyprian, Ep. lxxiii. § 22.
[5] Epistola ad Fortunatum de Exhortatione Martyrii, Præf. § iv.
[6] Origen, Exhort. ad Martyr. § 28.
[7] § 30. Rev. vi. 9.

of St. Paul, "What mean ye to weep and break mine heart? For I am ready not to be bound only, but also to die at Jerusalem for the name of the Lord Jesus"—and the sharp rebuke of our Lord himself, when Peter would have heedlessly withdrawn his thoughts from his Passion, "Get thee behind me, Satan." These passages of holy Writ, and many more, which were, or which they considered to be of like import, they did not, I say, forget; but it was the circumstances in which they found themselves placed, that chiefly prompted these glowing eulogies of the martyr. Origen's treatise, abounding in incautious terms beyond any other, as I have remarked, was written on the spur of the moment. So was Cyprian's De Exhortatione Martyrii. So probably would it be perceived from internal evidence were all the works of the Fathers which have this subject chiefly for their theme. Their heart was hot within them, and so they spake with their tongue; much in the spirit of Latimer in a like condition, "Be of good comfort, master Ridley, and play the man." Those circumstances, I repeat, Barbeyrac does not allow for; is not, it should seem, adequately acquainted with: his reading had not put him in possession of a minute knowledge of the critical times, in which the Fathers lived—times when the infant Church in the midst of hostile powers was struggling for existence; when, to use the words of Irenæus, "there was a movement of the whole earth against it;"[1] and when under God it mainly owed its survival and growth to the example of its professors, the severity with which they lived, and above all, the courage with which many among them took their deaths. These were days in which the value of the martyr was incalculable. For only look at a few of the many hints to this effect, with which the writings of the Fathers abundantly supply us, and which never could have been permitted to produce their due impression upon the mind of Barbeyrac, or he would have written on this subject of martyrdom in a different spirit. Clemens somewhere remarks[2] that to see an Indian burn would be worth many treatises on patience. And most truly does Tertullian say in terms which a little altered have become an apophthegm, "the blood of the martyr is the seed of the Church."[3] It was the spectacle of the constancy of the Chris-

[1] Irenæus, IV. c. xxxiii. § 13.

[2] Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xx. p. 494.

[3] Semen est sanguis Christianorum.—Tertullian, Apol. c. 1.

tians under persecution to the death that first moved Justin (a type of thousands no doubt) to examine and adopt their faith.[1] It was a test, Irenæus tells us, which none but Christians could sustain: their faith, such was its force, furnishing a multitude of martyrs at all times and in every place; whilst that of all other men flinched from this rigorous touch-stone[2]—a distinction, which could not fail to be observed and to produce its fruits. How strong is the evidence of this in Tertullian's appeal to Scapula, the President of Africa! "How will you deal," says he, "with so many thousands of either sex, men and women, of all ages, of all ranks? What fires, what swords will you need! How will Carthage bear the decimation, when everybody will find included in it some relation or friend! when there will be numbered in it men and matrons of your own order, chief persons in the state, the kindred perhaps of yours and of you! Spare then yourself, if you will not spare us. If you will not spare yourself, spare Carthage." "Never will this sect fail: but will flourish the more, the more it is cut down. For whoever is a spectator of such sufferings and of such patience under them, will be staggered; will be led to inquire what there is in this cause; and when he shall have learned the truth will forthwith become himself a convert."[3] "I have felt," says Cyprian, writing to the same effect, but in a yet more graphic manner, "I have felt, nor has the truth deceived me, when the ruthless hands of the executioner have been tearing the limbs asunder; when the savage tormentor has been ploughing up the lacerated members, and still been unable to prevail over his victim—I have felt by the words of the bystanders that there was something majestic in not being subdued by pain, in not being broken by penal anguish. Then might be heard the words of those who said, And I think he has children! for he has a wife, the companion of his home! and yet he does not yield to the attachment of these pledges; nor seduced by the influence of affection does he falter in his purpose. His mettle is to be tried; his virtue is to be proved to the very bowels. That is no light confession, be it what it may, for which a man endures the possibility of dying. And indeed, brethren dearly beloved, such is the power of martyrdom, that by force of it

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. II. § 12.
[2] Irenæus, IV. c. xxxiii. § 9.
[3] Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, c. v.

even he who *has undertaken to be thy executioner is constrained to become a believer.*"[1] Such was the effect, the powerful effect of the martyr's death on the cause of the Gospel in those days. What a price would naturally, would justly be set upon it! especially when to this consideration is added on the other hand that of the numbers, who, put to the trial, flinched and fell away[2]; in many cases too attempting to justify or excuse their lapse by an argument the most jesuitical; that the name of the Deity being merely a matter of convention, it could be of no consequence whether they said, I worship the Supreme God, or whether they called him Jupiter, or Apollo, or any other designation of heathen mythology[3] —an equivocation, which Origen would not have taken so much pains to expose on so many occasions as he does, idle as it is in itself, unless it had been working much mischief to the Church.[4] I repeat then, how inevitably would the death of the martyr be held in the highest honour, when numbers, whether thus trifling with their consciences, or at once confessing their fears, fell away; numbers so great, that it became a subject of anxious controversy in the Church how to deal with them, shedding their disastrous influence on the faith they were abandoning; and whose apostacy only rendered the constancy of those who were true to the last still more matter for eulogy and praise: that *they* should have withstood the lash, the club, the hook, the flame, which had shaken the spirits of others who had made up their minds to die, till the instruments of suffering were applied[5]; that *they* should have been proof against the pardon which was still offered them in the face of their danger and distress,[6] and even against the supplication of the magistrates to have mercy on themselves[7]; nay, sometimes of magistrates who would go so far as to suggest to them how they should shape their answers in order to gain an acquittal![8] All these things might well give a tincture to the sentiments of the Fathers, when speaking of their martyrdom: and candid critics, taking them into account, would be slow to censure the *morality* of such men, if after administering due

[1] Cyprian, De Laude Martyrii, §§ xv. xvi.

[2] Ep. ii. *Ad* prima statim verba minantis inimici *maximus* fratrum numerus fidem suam prodidit.—De Lapsis, § vii.

[3] Origen, Exhort. ad Martyr. § 46.

[4] See Contra Celsum, I. § 24 *et seq.*; IV. § 48; V. § 46.

[5] Cyprian, De Lapsis, § xiii.

[6] Ep. xv.

[7] Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, c. v.

[8] c. iv.

caution, as we have seen, against volunteering a confession which would cost the parties their life if persisted in, they did applaud in language the most animated and glowing, language perhaps barely to be justified in tranquil times, the maintenance of that confession to the death, when once it had been made.

Another conspicuous charge against the morality of the Fathers, alleged by Barbeyrac, is the unfavourable manner in which they sometimes express themselves on the subject of marriage, and especially of second marriage. Dr. Waterland takes notice of the complaint of M. Barbeyrac against Athenagoras for disallowing *second* marriages. "The fact," says he, "is true in some sense or other; but what second marriages is the question. Might not Athenagoras mean, marrying again after wrongful *divorce?* A very learned man" (Suicer under the word δίγαμος is the one referred to) "has pleaded much and well for that construction; and it is favoured by Athenagoras's grounding his doctrine upon our Lord's own words relating to *such* second marriages."[1] I think, from expressions that drop from Dr. Waterland in the course of his remarks, that he had some misgivings about the soundness of this defence; and there are many places in the Fathers which seem to me to indicate in them a distaste for second marriages, without any distinction of the kind here intimated by Dr. Waterland.[2] And when we combine these with others even commending abstinence from marriage altogether, when it can be abstained from with continence, we may be induced the rather to believe that there was an objection amongst them to second marriages in general.[3] I will not affirm that the Fathers do not bring many collateral arguments to support their views on this subject that are feeble and unsatisfactory. It is often their way, when debating a great question, and when they have strong grounds to stand upon, to adduce supplemental reasons for the side they take, which, with readers in these days, would rather weaken their cause than strengthen it—howbeit there was, no doubt, often a peculiarity in the people they were addressing and the times in which they wrote, that caused such arguments to be then very differently appre-

[1] Waterland, On the Use and Value of Ecclesiastical Antiquity. Works, vol. v. p. 297.

[2] Tertullian, Ad Uxorem, I. c. vii.; Canon. Apostol. xvii.

[3] Adv. Marcion. V. c. xv.

ciated. But again, I say, it was the *circumstances of the times* in which their lot was cast that coloured their sentiments on the question of marriage: that however other adventitious notions might have operated in a subordinate degree, it was the circumstances of the times which constrained them to speak of marriage, whether first or second, in the temper they did—circumstances which, I still repeat, Barbeyrac does not take into account as he should, when pronouncing his opinion—and those circumstances the same which modified St. Paul's own views on the subject, "the present distress." And this latter consideration appears to have crossed the mind of Barbeyrac himself, who is disposed to qualify the language even of the Apostle, as though, according to the ordinary translation of it, he was himself too hard upon marriage, objecting to the usual translation of γνώμην δίδωμι, "I give my judgment,"[1] and alleging that it means no more than "I give you my thoughts," —"je vous dis ma pensée."[2] The very passage indeed which he cites from Athenagoras turns upon these circumstances. It was a notorious slander against the early Christians, a slander arising either from the secrecy with which they found it necessary to hold their assemblies for religious worship,[3] or from the reputed profligate practices of certain antinomian heretics who were confounded with them, for the fact does not seem to have been *proved* even against them—it was a notorious charge, I say, against the early Christians that they met for the purpose of the grossest debauchery. The line of argument, which the Fathers in general pursue when replying to this accusation, is to assert the peculiarly pure precepts of the Gospel which governed the Christians; precepts which, so far from allowing any such turpitude, laid even the lawful gratification of the passions under severe restraint, and, not content with regulating the actions, reached even to the very motions of the heart.[4] The more to enforce this exposition of the chastity required by the Gospel, they, in some instances, call attention to the number of persons of both sexes who lived in a state of celibacy, because they thought that condition favourable to religious impressions[5]; not unnaturally, perhaps, construing our Lord's own words on this subject to that effect, "He that is able to

[1] 1 Cor. vii. 25.
[2] Barbeyrac, p. 111.
[2] Minucius Felix, Octav. c. x.
[4] Athenagoras, Legat. pro Christianis, § 33.
[5] Ibid.

receive it, let him receive it."[1] Such, then, being the jealousy with which the Christians were watched by their heathen enemies, and such one of the most common, popular, and effective of the accusations brought against them, were the Fathers to be blamed if they encouraged, as far as was consistent with the observance of continence in the parties (for they utterly denounce all breach of it), celibacy rather than marriage, and one marriage rather than two? It was the peculiar position of the Christian Church at the time, which instigated them to proclaim this preference; it was a prudential consideration for the good of the Church under existing circumstances: and though, as I have said, they may have supported this preference by other subordinate arguments, feeble and futile in themselves, the main cause of their asserting it at all was what I have alleged, "the present distress." And Barbeyrac must not condemn their morality in coming to the decision they did, without having more regard to the nature of the case than he displays. The question was not whether celibacy in the abstract was a better estate than marriage, or one marriage better than two; but whether, at that especial crisis, the inculcation of such forbearance from a lawful indulgence was not wholesome.

But a desire to meet this popular calumny was not the only cause which operated on the minds of the Fathers when they encouraged single life and single marriage. There was another which probably moved them yet more powerfully, still connected with the times in which they wrote—a due consideration for the effects of *persecution* on all the domestic relations. "Woe unto them that are with child, and to them that give suck in those days," says our Lord himself, when anticipating the troubles that were coming on Jerusalem. Age was not a protection: girls and boys were among the victims.[2] Was it not natural that the Fathers of the Church should not encourage parental ties to be multiplied when liable to such violent disruption? Would they not very reasonably think that love for wife and child would constantly prove too strong a temptation for the courage and constancy of men who would otherwise have borne the cross and flame without a shudder? What a world it was, must any husband or parent have thought, to cast those that were nearest and dearest

[1] Matt. xix. 12. [2] Cyprian, Ep. lxxvii. § 6; lxxxi. § 3; De Lapsis, § ii.

to him upon! What a scene of trial and trouble to which to commit them, to struggle through alone! Look at Tertullian's address to his wife, written on the prospect of her becoming a widow; written, certainly, after he became a follower of Montanus, but dictated by the feelings, not of a Montanist, but of a Christian man. See the particular sources of anxiety beyond those which would oppress the mind of a husband in ordinary times, when contemplating the future fortunes of his partner, with himself no longer for her guide and guardian—the particular sources of anxiety, I say, he found in the character of his own days and the perils with which they were beset! It is a document well worth the perusal of those who, with Barbeyrac, discover cause for blame in the sentiments of the Fathers on the subject of marriage. He bequeaths to his wife, he says, the legacy of his recommendation that she should not marry again; not urging this for his own sake, or out of any jealousy of her, but simply with a view to her own welfare. What were children, but the most bitter of pleasures, (liberorum amarissima voluptas?)[1] so much so, that Christian parents are only anxious that their children should go before them to Heaven, and escape the temptations of a longer life (the dangers and trials to which they were then exposed prompting, no doubt, so unnatural a sentiment as this)—and well they might, for, apart from all fears they might entertain of their becoming the victims of the persecutor, there was the apprehension that they could hardly help becoming the victims of the heathen society amongst which their forlorn lot was in a great measure cast; and those ecclesiastical constitutions[2] which have reference to orphans, and which enjoin the brethren (often we may suppose without effect) that they who have no children themselves should adopt such outcasts, and the Bishops that they should endeavour to see to them, giving assistance to such children that they may learn a trade, and so be enabled to buy themselves tools, and be put in a condition to earn their bread, and no longer burden the Church—these regulations, I say, though most humane in themselves, bespeak the aspect of the times, and go but a little way towards relieving a dying father's heart as to the future fortunes of his family. But to return to the tract of Tertullian. What if she should marry

[1] Ad Uxorem, I. c. v. [2] Constit. Apostol. IV. cc. i. ii.

a heathen, forgetting the Apostle's injunction, "only in the Lord"—a thought, which then obviously embittered Tertullian's contemplations of the future, more than any other; and one on which he bestows his advice at great length, appropriating to it a second book of this address. It was in those days no chimerical fear. The Christians were then in a minority; they had to do with heathens intimately in the most ordinary affairs of life. "I wrote unto you," saith the Apostle, "not to company with fornicators: yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world."[1] That was then the state of things; the Christians bearing so small a proportion to the heathens, that they could not avoid mixing with them, and taking the chance of the contamination such society might effect. Tertullian presses on his wife's attention St. Paul's forbiddal of such unhallowed bands: dwells on the excommunication of the party by the Church[2]; reminds her of the impossibility there would be, under such circumstances, that she should continue to serve God. Is a meeting for prayer appointed (statio facienda)? her husband will propose a resort to the bath. A fast? he will have a feast instead. A procession? household matters forbid it. Would he allow her to go from street to street, and from cabin to cabin, to visit the brethren? Would he permit her to take part in the nightly assemblies, when her turn came? Or when Easter called her? To partake of the Lord's Supper; an institution which they suspect? To creep to prison to kiss the chains of the martyrs? To salute the brethren? To wash the feet of the saints? To offer them hospitality? To minister unto them when sick[3]? Or if he did endure all or any of these proceedings in silence, what else would it be for, but to treasure up in his memory the means of taking revenge on his wife, if at any future time she might happen to provoke him[4]? Would she be prepared for the unseemly scenes in which she would have to participate with him, the tavern revel, the obscene song[5]? He might tempt her by his wealth, trappings, equipage, chamberlains; she was but receiving a husband at the devil's hands.[6] These were some few of the many sad forebodings

[1] 1 Cor. v. 9, 10.
[2] Tertullian, Ad Uxorem, II. c. iii.
[3] c. iv.
[4] c. v.
[5] c. vi.
[6] c. viii.

which crossed, it seemed, a Christian husband's mind in those days on the prospect of his own death; forebodings engendered altogether, or almost altogether, by the state of the times; and was it not reasonable and right that the leaders of the Church should not encourage men to contract marriage without carefully beforehand counting the cost, and considering what deep interests, indeed what everlasting interests, were probably concerned in the issue of a marriage? Barbeyrac lived after the temperate recommendation of celibacy dictated by the severity of the times of the early Church had been carried to excess; and the compulsory vow of the convent and the monastery had been the abuse that had grown out of it; but the Fathers could not possibly foresee the practical extravagance to which a principle, innocent in itself, will proceed, and are not answerable for it. Let us not, in our hostility to popish corruptions, be unjust to the memory of those who did not contemplate them; and yet to whom, in some instances, those corruptions, taking their beginning from some harmless or even praiseworthy origin, may be traced.

LECTURE XI.

Further illustration of the defect in Barbeyrac's reasoning. Examination of his charge against Tertullian of interdicting trades connected with idolatry, the profession of arms, national customs, offices of state. Unfairness of regarding in the abstract what was meant only to apply to particular circumstances. Sentiments of Tertullian and Cyprian on self-defence accounted for. Justification of idolatry among the Pagans in Clemens, owing to a misinterpretation of Deut. iv. 19. His real opinion on that subject. Defence of writers subsequent to the third century declined. Late ecclesiastical antiquity less deserving of confidence. Subjects of the second Series.

YOU will remember that my object in the remarks I am making on Barbeyrac's treatise on the morality of the Fathers is not to follow him through every particular case which he adduces in detail, but to show that one defect pervades his reasoning throughout almost all of them, that of not taking into account the *peculiar character* of the times in which the Fathers lived—a defect arising, as I suggested, from Barbeyrac not having carefully read their writings for himself, and so not having possessed his mind thoroughly with a full and correct impression of those times, but having contented himself with using passages with which others supplied him—passages detached from the authors to which they belonged, and which simply served as texts for his Philippics. I gave proof of this fact from his animadversions on the manner in which they speak of *martyrdom*, and of *marriage*, and especially of *second marriage*. I pursue my observations, and I find further proof, in his strictures on Tertullian more particularly for the blame that Father casts on those who minister to what is wrong, however indirectly and however incidentally. Thus, says Barbeyrac, Tertullian, in his treatise on Idolatry, absolutely condemns every trade, profession, and calling which can in any way be of use to the heathens in carrying on their idolatrous worship, however difficult it may be for the parties to earn a maintenance by any other means; and Barbeyrac adds that he might as well interdict the sale of wine or of arms, because the one may

serve for debauchery and the other for violence. Possibly Tertullian may show himself over sensitive and impracticable in the restrictions he thus lays on the occupations of the Christian, nor may have sufficiently distinguished the circumstances which render the dealer accountable for the buyer's use of the articles which he sold him; but, at all events, the side he took was the safe one; nor, if we consider how idolatry had then wormed itself into the whole structure of society, shall we, perhaps, think that his interdicts were extravagant. He found, for instance, the carver by trade, though professing himself to be a Christian, tempted to make images for heathen temples[1], arguing as his excuse the difficulty of getting a living, and the Apostle's precept, "Let every man abide in the same calling wherein he was called"[2]; nay, in some cases these excuses of his connived at, and men who had so exercised their craft permitted to discharge inferior offices in the Church.[3] He found the schoolmaster—he, too, being a Christian—teaching the adventures of the heathen gods, not after those gods had become despised and obsolete, but whilst they were yet the actual gods of the multitude; and continuing, from custom, perhaps, the old-established usages of the school, dedicating the first payments of the scholars to Minerva; receiving presents from the friends of his boys on heathen festivals[4]; keeping the holidays of Flora at the appointment of the Flamen or Ædile. He found the cattle-jobber, still a professing Christian, not scrupling to purchase victims for the use of the heathen temples[5]; and the dealer in incense—he too, a Christian—having for his principal customers (a thing of which he must have himself been perfectly aware) the heathen priests.[6] It msut be confessed that it was very difficult to correct callings of this kind, which had so close, though not a necessary connection with idolatry, by any other means than denouncing them altogether. Tertullian does denounce them, certainly, contending that the exercise of an idolatrous trade cannot be justified by the plea of getting a maintenance by it. The cost should have been counted before it was engaged in[7]; the cross, which the renunciation of that trade imposes, must be borne. James and John forsook their calling: a

[1] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. iv. [2] c. v. [3] c. vii. [4] c. x. [5] c. xi. [6] Ibid. [7] c. xii.

sound faith has no fear of lacking food.[1] At the same time he suggests that mechanics might often turn their hands to other branches of their business. The mason, for instance, can repair houses, plaster walls, line cisterns, coat columns, and work in stucco upon walls other ornaments besides images. He who can draw a figure, can paint a slab: he, who can carve a Mercury, can put together a chest of drawers. There are few temples to be built, but many houses; few Mercuries to be gilded, but many sandals and slippers: "luxury and vainglory," he adds in one of the many sentences in him which strongly remind us of Tacitus (an author, however, who does not appear to have enjoyed his sympathy, for he denounces him as a most mendacious writer,[2]) "luxury and vainglory are worth far more to the artist than all kinds of superstition."[3]

Barbeyrac further exemplifies this confounding of morality by Tertullian, in the condemnation he passes on the profession of arms[4]: and he quotes some strong passages to this effect from the same tract on Idolatry. "How can a Christian," argues Tertullian, "go to war; nay, how can he serve even in peace without a sword; which the Lord has taken away from him? For though soldiers came to John and were instructed by him in their duty; and though a centurion was a believer; yet Jesus declared against the profession of arms, when he bade Peter put his sword into its sheath."[5] Nor can it be said that his Montanism narrows his view upon this subject; for even before his Montanism he seems to have demurred to the lawfulness of this calling; as appears from a few words in his "De Patientiâ."[6] No doubt some of the reasons, the subordinate reasons, or rhetorical reasons one would rather call them, with which he underprops his main one, are puerile enough. I have before acknowledged in a similar case this propensity in the Fathers to accumulate poor arguments, as if they strengthened good ones. Thus here, in the "De Coronâ,"[7] Tertullian asks in his declamatory manner, "Shall the soldier rest upon his spear, when it was a spear which pierced his Saviour's side? Shall he have the trumpet

[1] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xii.
[2] Ille mendaciorum loquacissimus.—Apol. c. xvi.
[3] Frequentior est omni superstitione luxuria et ambitio.—De Idololatriâ, c. viii.
[4] Barbeyrac, p. 74.
[5] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xix.
[6] De Patientiâ, c. vii.
[7] De Coronâ, c. xi.

to sound over his corpse, when he expects the archangel's?" and so on. But still it is easy to see that the cardinal objection, which weighed with him was the close contact, which the calling of the soldier brought him into with idolatry, and the species of sanction, which, under certain circumstances, he seemed compelled to afford it. For example, it was his duty to carry the standard, which was a rival of Christ, for with the soldiers the standard was an object of worship.[1] He had to swear by false gods when he took the military oath.[2] It was a part of his business to mount guard before the temples over idols which he had renounced at his Baptism. Barbeyrac, however, contends that it was a needless scruple in Tertullian to make the mounting guard over a temple a matter of objection. The temples of the false gods, says he, were only public buildings which belonged to the sovereign; and as sovereign he had a right to entrust the custody of them to any of his subjects, whether soldiers or not. It was a service purely civil.[3] There may be many who will prefer the scrupulosity of Tertullian to the liberality of Barbeyrac, particularly when the character of these temples, over which the Christian soldier was to stand sentry, is taken into account. These temples, as Barbeyrac might have learned from the Fathers, were made to produce a considerable revenue to the emperor, and were farmed by speculating contractors,[4] who usually took them on five years' leases,[5] and by auction.[6] They were regular brothels; the priests themselves the panders[7]; nothing being so natural, as that the heathen lessees who stood at rack rent, like our toll-bar keepers, bent on making the most of their bargain, should furnish them with such attractions as would draw to them the populace, and rival one another in all the profitable arts of seduction. And these were the places, over which the Christian soldier had to mount guard; and this the society to which he was to be exposed, whilst performing his duty. Do not the circumstances of the case and the times, I again say, go very far to excuse or even to justify Tertullian in diverting by any means

[1] Tertullian, De Coronâ, c. xi.

[2] So I interpret, credimusne humanum sacramentum divino superinduci licere, et in alium Dominum respondere post Christum?—Ibid.

[3] Barbeyrac, p. 76.

[4] Tertullian, Apol. c. xiii.; Theophilus, I. § 10.

[5] Tertull. Ad Nationes, I. § 10.

[6] Apol. c. xiii.

[7] Minucius Felix, Octav. c. xxv.

Christians from a profession which put them necessarily in the way of such contamination? And is his morality to be so very much condemned because he does so? It is a very different question from the lawfulness of the military service in the abstract, and as that service is at present constituted and practised.

So, again, with respect to the Christian adorning his door with lamps and laurels; a custom, which Tertullian denounces in Christians, and for which sentiment Barbeyrac reproves him, saying that the festival which occasioned the display of such emblems, was ordered by the prince, and that they had no necessary connection with idolatry[1]; with respect to this custom, I say, allowance must be made as before for the state of the times. In the lamp and the laurel there was nothing, but if on such occasions the door was universally regarded by the people as a shrine, and the decorations as offerings to the Divinity, which presided over it, whether Cardea, or Forculus, or Limentinus, or Janus himself[2] (for all these were Deities which appertained to that quarter of the house), then the lawfulness of the custom wears quite another aspect. If it was understood that what was done in honour of the door was done in honour of the idol, to whom the door was consecrated, as Tertullian affirms was the case, his argument seems sound, that having renounced the idol temple, you must not make an idol temple of your door; and at all events the matter is far from being the simple civil affair which Barbeyrac would represent it. Nor, in fact, does Tertullian in this instance write in any extreme or extravagant spirit; for almost in the same breath, he makes a concession to social convenience, such as shows that in the other instance he was advising in no morose temper of mind; and allows the Christian to attend the private and ordinary days of festivity in heathen families, such as the assumption of the toga, a marriage, or the naming of a child: and though sacrifices usually attended these solemnities, yet merely to the spectator of them, he thinks they could hardly be considered to involve the party in the guilt of them. But even here Tertullian naturally subjoins a wish; "Would to God we were not called upon to witness what it is not lawful for ourselves to do! But since through the devices of the evil one, idolatry compasses the world on

[1] Barbeyrac, p. 77. [2] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xv.

every side, we may be permitted to be present on some occasions, which are calculated to show our kindly and dutiful feelings, not for idols, but for our fellow-creatures."[1]

Barbeyrac finds similar fault[2] with Tertullian for what he says on the subject of a Christian holding office or magisterial function in the state. And here, I think, his animadversions may be qualified by the same means as before, *i. e.* by a due regard to the circumstances of the times. It is obvious that Tertullian, in all the remarks which he makes upon this and upon other kindred subjects, exhibits a mind thoroughly possessed with the enormous difficulties which the idolatry that surrounded them, threw in the way of the Christians, and embarrassed them in all their movements, however otherwise blameless or indifferent. It is not the lawfulness or unlawfulness of acting as a judge or magistrate in the abstract, which Tertullian debates (as Barbeyrac would seem to represent the question[3]); but whether a Christian should undertake such a province, as things then were, and with the obstacles before him which such a position would evidently expose him to. This is the proposition in his thoughts, however he may fail to express it in so many words. It is true that Tertullian may appear to lay undue stress on the particulars of pomp and parade with which such an office was accompanied, the prætexta, the trabea, the laticlave, the fasces, the wands, the purple, as if the gravamen lay in these; and it is true, also, that Tertullian, the better to reconcile his readers to the recommendation that they should have nothing to do with such offices, suggests the modest and humble aspect of our Lord, and his indisposition to be treated with kingly honours[4]; but even here the main objection to these trappings is the relation they bore to idolatry—the question of the habits at the period of the Reformation, deeply aggravated, as it might well be, being even then the matter of offence—they were to be shunned because, in the eye of the people, they were associated intimately with the worship of false gods; the figures of those gods were dressed in these robes; the processions, in honour of them, were attended by these insignia.[5] It is impossible to say what weight should be ascribed to this argument, unless we knew more intimately

[1] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xvi.
[2] Barbeyrac, p. 83.
[3] pp. 85, 86.
[4] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xviii.
[5] Ibid.

than we possibly can know, the state of public feeling upon this point, and how far it really did identify these pageants with idolatry, and especially in the estimation of the weaker brethren, for whom St. Paul himself tells us consideration is to be had. But independently of this argument, Tertullian puts forward a number of inconveniences which would distress the Christian in the discharge of such duties, though he puts them ex abundanti and with a proviso, that even if they could be escaped, there was still cause enough left in such matters as I have just been adverting to, to deter him from embarking in such an occupation. "Let us admit," says Tertullian, for argument's sake, (that is his way of stating it,) "let us admit that by possibility it may happen to a man to enjoy an honour of this kind, and to make his way unencumbered by anything but the honour; neither called upon to do sacrifice, nor to sanction sacrifice by his authority, nor to deal in the victims for sacrifice, nor to appoint to the charge of the temples, nor gather the revenues derived from them, nor exhibit shows and games on his own account or on that of the public, nor preside over them, by whomsoever exhibited; let him have no judgment to pronounce, no edict to put forth, no oath to take; nay, let him be exempt from matters which strictly fall under magisterial duty; let him adjudicate on no man's life or character (I say nothing about fines); let him neither condemn nor make damnatory laws; let him consign no man to fetters, to prison, or to torture: *if it is credible that such a state of things could subsist*,[1]—still, even allowing all this," contends Tertullian, "the very pomp and decoration of his office is so associated with idolatry, that that alone should induce him to refrain from it."[2] He may seem to waive the stronger argument, and rely upon the weaker, but a sense of the enormous hindrance in the way of a Christian magistrate, which a state of heathen society would present, is at the bottom of the whole reasoning. Nor can he be said to waive the other; for he expressly, you see, affirms, that exemption from such embarrassments, as he is supposing, is a thing incredible; that in point of fact, the party would have to do sacrifice, to preside over sacrifices, to exhibit spectacles, and so on, or in other words to be himself an idolater; and again, in point of fact, would have to adjudicate on men's lives

[1] Si hæc credibile est fieri posse. [2] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xvii.

and characters, to fine, imprison, and torture. And who, may we presume, would be the parties between whom he would be perpetually called to judge? Would it not be between heathens and Christians? We have already discovered incidentally what a disturbing force in the world the introduction of Christianity proved; and I could add to the proof of this to almost any extent by going into details: how truly our Lord's prophecy came to pass, that he was not about "to send peace on earth, but a sword." There were endless calls for the interposition of the law to settle disputes and troubles which arose from the husband being a pagan, and the wife a believer; from the master and servant standing to one another in the like relation, and so on. There were contentions continually brewing from the consciousness of the heathen party on such occasions that he had the laws in his favour, and had his victim at his mercy; that he could treasure up a grievance to a future day, and produce it when the time served. There must have been numberless civil suits between the pagan and Christian most painful for the latter to decide. The mere debtor and creditor business between them must have been full of perplexity. The bond required an oath, a heathen oath; necessity on the one hand urging to it, conscience on the other resenting it[1]; Tertullian himself almost at a loss how to advise, and ending what he has to say on the subject with a prayer that Christians may not be driven to the extremity of borrowing from heathens, but may find those who could lend amongst the brethren.

How could a Christian reconcile it to himself to volunteer placing himself in a position of such enormous difficulty by acting as a magistrate in these courts? And how can we find fault with Tertullian for dissuading him from so doing by every argument he can devise, however little to the purpose some of them may be? We are not, I must again remind you, to consider the question as Barbeyrac does, in cool blood, whether it is convenient for a Christian under any circumstances, and at any time, to bear the sword, to pass sentence of death, and so on; but whether under those circumstances, and at that time, it was convenient to do so. I repeat, it was the idolatry of the day that was influencing the mind of Tertullian in all the decisions we are now considering, as is obvious

[1] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xxiii.

from the passage with which he closes his treatise on idolatry, where they are all found. "These," says he, "are the rocks and bays; those the shores and straits of idolatry, amidst which faith, with sails filled by the Spirit of God, makes her voyage, safe, if cautious, secure, if wide awake.[1] But for those who are unshipped, there is in idolatry a deep which cannot be swum out of; for those who are dashed against it, a wreck which cannot be cleared; for those who are swallowed up, a submersion[2] which cannot be breathed in; whoever are choked by its waves, every vortex which it hath sucks them under to hell. Let no man then say, who can take all the precautions necessary for safety, unless he retired altogether from the world? as if it were not better to retire from it, than to live in it and be an idolater. Nothing can be more easy than precaution against idolatry, if there is a real fear of it.[3] Any necessity is a trifle compared with peril so vast. Therefore did the Holy Spirit, when the Apostles held their council, relax for us the bond and the yoke, in order that we might be at leisure for avoiding idolatry. This will be our law; the more fully to be observed and required, in proportion as it is itself more simple and unembarrassed; the law proper to Christians; the law by which we are recognised and tested by heathens; the law which is to be propounded to those who are approaching towards the faith, to be inculcated to those who are entering on the faith, in order that those who are approaching the faith may ponder, and those who are keeping the faith may continue to do so, and those who are not keeping it may renounce themselves (and their profession). For we may consider whether according to the figure of the ark, the crow, and the kite, and the wolf, and the dog, and the serpent, may not be in the Church. But there can be no doubt that in the figure of the ark the idolater is not found. No animal can be made to represent the idolater. And what was not in the ark, let not the same be in the Church."[4] I have given this winding up of the Treatise on Idolatry at full, in order to show how entirely the practical speculations of Tertullian, in the course of it, had been governed by his horror of a sin which, as he had said at the opening of his essay, comprised every other.[5]

[1] Attonita. [2] Hypobrychium.
[3] Or, a fear to begin with, in capite.
[4] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xxiv.
[5] Summus sæculi reatus.—c. i.

On the subject of *self-defence* Barbeyrac regards the morality of the Fathers, of Tertullian and Cyprian more especially, to be utterly faulty[1]; carrying as they do the duty of patience to such an extreme, as to be scarcely compatible with self-preservation. A passage or two to this effect he produces, written, however, in that loose and rhetorical manner, for which allowance is always to be made. For instance, "The soldiers of Christ cannot be conquered, but can die; and by this very thing they prove themselves to be invincible, viz. by having no fear of death. Neither do they resist those who assail them, seeing that, *it is not lawful even for the innocent to slay the guilty;* but they deliver up their lives and their blood with alacrity, in order that they may the sooner retire from the ills and cruelties of a world wherein so much malice and barbarity prevails."[2] But a paragraph of this kind is a very insufficient foundation of any serious charge. The fact is, that at the time when these Fathers wrote, the Christians were in a minority, surrounded by fierce and watchful enemies; as our Lord expresses it, "sheep in the midst of wolves." In such a condition, the only chance for them was *patience;* patience proceeding almost to the degree of non-resistance; it was by far the most effectual defence that could be set up. Vincit qui patitur, was the best motto for them. And accordingly we find both Cyprian and Tertullian furnishing express essays on this virtue: but they are not philosophical essays: they were not dreaming of writing like Puffendorf and Barbeyrac on "natural rights:" the times in which they lived and the scenes in which they were concerned invited to no such tranquil speculations. Both these compositions are of the nature of Sermons or Homilies; "Fratres dilectissimi" is indeed the pulpit phraseology with which Cyprian interlards his address: they have for their object to brace up the hearers or readers of them to meet the distresses and dangers of the times; and to teach them not to faint in the day of trial. "And as we are all involved in the sentence" (on Adam) such is their language, "we can escape from it only by death. Therefore it is that we naturally weep when we are first brought into the world, testifying instinctively that it is a world of trouble: and patience supplies the only remedy to all; but most of all to *us*, whom

[1] Barbeyrac, pp. 91. 128.

[2] Cyprian, Ep. lvii. § 2.

persecutions, the gaol, the sword, the wild-beast, the fire, the cross, and whatever other engine of torment there may be, assail. Even as our Lord said, 'In the world ye shall have tribulation, but be of good cheer, I have overcome the world.'"[1] And if Abel is adduced as a praiseworthy example of patient sufferance, who, when attacked by Cain, made no resistance[2] —for it is presumed of him from the silence of Scripture— surely this is scarcely to be drawn into a grave argument (as it is by Barbeyrac), that by such reasoning Cyprian was subverting the natural right of self-defence.[3] In the eloquent eulogy on patience with which Tertullian closes his treatise on it, it is significantly said, in a long catalogue of its merits, "It strengthens faith"—"it rules the flesh"—"it bridles the tongue"—"it subdues temptations"—"it consummates martyrdom"—"it charms the believer"—"it attracts the unbeliever"[4]—the virtue evidently presenting itself to the mind of Tertullian in those aspects which a state of risk and danger in the times in which he lived suggested to him.

There is one particular more in the essay of M. Barbeyrac to which I think it needful to draw your attention; and though differing in character from some of them already noticed, it still serves to confirm me in my affirmation that Barbeyrac, in passing judgment on the morality of the Fathers, did not take sufficiently into account the condition of the times and of public opinion when they wrote. It is this; the justification of idolatry amongst the *Pagans*, which Barbeyrac imputes to Clemens Alexandrinus,[5] when that Father says, that "God had given them the sun, the moon, and the stars, to worship (*εἰς θρησκείαν*)." I have, indeed, touched on this question before, and shown that Clemens, whose principle it was to make the heathen philosophy a stepping-stone to Christian truth, and so to tempt the learned Gentiles to a purer faith, did consider the heavenly bodies as objects set up for the religious contemplation of the Gentiles, in order that they might be saved, as he expressly says, from becoming vicious atheists, and that, carrying their thoughts up from these glorious creatures to God their Creator, they might be delivered from falling down and worshipping images, wood,

[1] Cyprian, de Bono Patientiæ, § xii.
[2] De Zelo et Livore, § v.
[3] Barbeyrac, p. 128.
[4] Tertullian, De Patientiâ, c. xv.
[5] Stromat. VI. c. xiv. p. 795.

and stone—even the worship of the stars being thought better than the worship of stocks, as being more likely to advance the worshipper to the contemplation of God himself. But what led Clemens into this particular error was no obliquity in his morality, but simply a misinterpretation of a verse in Scripture,[1] "And lest thou lift up thine eyes unto heaven, and when thou seest the sun, and the moon, and the stars, even all the host of heaven, shouldest be driven to worship them and serve them, which the Lord thy God hath divided unto all nations under the whole heaven. But the Lord hath taken *you*" (*i. e.* the Israelites, as opposed to the Gentiles), "and brought *you* forth"—as though Moses had said, that the Israelites were not to worship the host of heaven, they having been furnished with better knowledge and a holier creed; but that to all the *nations* (*i. e.* the Gentiles as distinguished from the Jews) God had permitted these heavenly bodies to be objects of worship. Moreover, the Septuagint, which was the Scripture Clemens knew, was capable of being drawn into this meaning much more easily—ἃ ἀπένειμε Κύριος ὁ Θεός σου αὐτὰ πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι τοῖς ὑποκάτω τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. ὑμᾶς δὲ ἔλαβεν ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ ἐξήγαγεν ὑμᾶς, κ. τ. λ. Now we know that Clemens entertained the same opinion as the Fathers before him, an opinion which had come down to the modern Jews, that the Septuagint translation was made by miracle, and was the work of inspiration, even as the original itself was.[2] What, therefore, appeared to him to be the sense of the text in Deuteronomy he could not but bow to, however he might have felt difficulties about it. And that difficulties he did feel, and put the interpretation upon it he did, not because he wished to warp a text to support a theory, but because he was not aware of any other exposition,[3] seems to be proved by the manner in which he expresses himself on two other occasions on the same subject, where the text of Deuteronomy does not happen to present itself to his mind, and where he speaks therefore under no constraint. For in the Exhortation to the Gentiles[4] he declares his surprise that men should have been found who worshipped the Divine workmanship, instead of God himself, absurdly supposing the sun, the moon, and the

[1] Deut. iv. 19.
[2] Stromat. I. c. xxii. pp. 409, 410.
[3] The same indeed was that of Justin, Dial. §§ 55. 121.
[4] Cohort. ad Gentes, § iv. pp. 54, 55.

chorus of the stars to be gods, whereas they were only instruments whereby to measure time. And in another passage in the same work, where he is describing the several sources from which idolatry took its beginning, he makes one of them to be this very admiration of the heavenly bodies, "Some, deceived by the spectacle of the heavens, or trusting to the eye alone, contemplated the motions of the stars, and admired and deified them, calling the stars gods (*θεοὺς*) from their motion (*ἐκ τοῦ θεῖν*); and worshipped the sun, like the Indians, and the moon, like the Phrygians."[1] The conclusion, therefore, we come to on the whole is, that the faulty views he puts forward on one single occasion, he does so put forward in deference to what he supposed to be Scripture; and only in deference to it: some constraint seeming to be laid upon his own judgment, as we gather from other parts of his writings, where the text of Scripture does not seem to occur to him.

I feel that I have now furnished you with the key by which, as it appears to me, the greater part of the objections of Barbeyrac may be solved; viz. his want of consideration for the popular character of the writings of the Fathers, and for the peculiar circumstances of the age in which they lived. I must, however, again remind you, that my remarks throughout these Lectures have been confined altogether to the Fathers of the first three centuries. I do not pretend to clear those of a later date, and particularly those of a *much* later, from all the charges which Daillé and Barbeyrac have brought against them; for their field is much wider than mine. My object has been in these Lectures, and in all that I have delivered on similar subjects, since I occupied my present post here, to interest my hearers on behalf of the Ante-Nicene Fathers; feeling as I do, that they are by far the most valuable of all, as being nearest the times of the Apostles; and feeling too, that their testimony, instead of unsettling your minds with respect to the doctrine and ritual of your own Church, will on the whole lead you to think, that you could betake yourself to no other, which so nearly resembles that of the primitive ages. I have said it before from this place, and I repeat it now, that it is not the reference to ecclesiastical antiquity, which has of late prevailed to such an extent, that has

[1] Cohort. ad Gentes, § ii. p. 22.

disturbed us, and given cause for jealousy and apprehension to so many, but it has been the reference to ecclesiastical antiquity of too low a date; a date, when the Church had lost much of the simplicity both of its faith and constitution. Such popular objections as are urged against the study even of these primitive Fathers, I trust I have in this Course of Lectures in a great measure removed. It will be my business in my Lectures next Term to follow up my present argument by an exposition of the *positive* advantages of many kinds which result from the study of the writers of the Ante-Nicene Church; and thus redeem the title which Daillé adopted "On the Use of the Fathers," whilst the only or chief object of his book proved to be, to persuade us that the Fathers are of no use at all.

Accordingly I shall show in these Lectures the light the study of the early Fathers casts upon the *Evidences*—the weapons with which they (in a peculiar manner) arm us against the infidel, and against Mr. Gibbon's infidelity more especially; by proving the rapid spread of Christianity over the world; by exhibiting the classes of society out of which its converts were made, and the mistake it is to suppose that they were exclusively of the lowest; by developing the care and caution with which their characters were sifted before their allegiance was received; by furnishing us with a true estimate of the extent and intensity of persecution they encountered and sustained, and the trying nature of some modes of it less obvious, and therefore less adverted to, but not less searching. I shall treat of the *miraculous powers* ascribed to the Primitive Church; and of its *ecclesiastical construction*. I shall explain the good offices the Fathers render us in our investigation of the *Canon* of Scripture—the *substance* of Scripture—the *text* of Scripture—and above all, the *meaning* of Scripture on great cardinal points, by reflecting to us the sense of the Primitive Church on them all, on the last of which subjects I shall have to dwell at some length.

I cannot but persuade myself that young men about to undertake the occupation of Ministers in Christ's Church, of teachers of the people in theological and ecclesiastical truth, particularly in times like our own, when so much error is abroad on such topics, and so many foundations subverted or shaken, which they may find themselves soon in a position to

restore or repair—I say, I cannot but persuade myself, that ingenuous men, with such prospects before them, may feel it a duty—an interesting duty—to make themselves acquainted with such questions as I have enumerated; and though no longer compelled to hear what I have to say on them by constraint, may be disposed to do so of good-will: and that I shall have the satisfaction of feeling, that in composing these Lectures, the results of many years' patient reading and thought, I have not been labouring in vain; but have a chance of diffusing the conclusions of my own experience through the country by the best of all channels, that of an enlightened and intelligent Clergy.

LECTURES

ON THE

RIGHT USE OF THE EARLY FATHERS.

SECOND SERIES.

ON THE ADVANTAGES TO BE DERIVED FROM THE STUDY OF THE EARLY FATHERS.

ON THE RIGHT USE

OF

THE EARLY FATHERS.

SECOND SERIES.

LECTURE I.

Use of the Fathers in relation to the Evidences. Their testimony to the *wide dispersion* of the Gospel opposed to the statements of Gibbon. His unfairness in citing them. Argument from their incidental allusions. More direct testimony to the early establishment of Christianity on the shores of the Mediterranean and Euxine, and in the countries beyond the Euphrates. Its secret progress illustrated from the Acts, from St. Paul's Epistles, from the Fathers. Its disturbance of the social relations instrumental to its propagation. Exposition of Phil. i. 12–18. Further illustrations. Effect of the public games.

THE Course of Lectures which I delivered last Term on the Use of the Fathers, was entirely occupied in removing or abating those charges against them, which are advanced by Daillé and Barbeyrac: for I thought it would be well to clear away objections to the study of them, before I proceeded to enforce their value; and I thought too, that it would not be easy to find any which had escaped the notice of those two unsparing critics. I now propose to redeem the promise I made at the close of that course, and to show some of the positive benefits which accrue from an examination of the Fathers; still limiting my subject to the Fathers of the first three centuries. A portion of the present argument indeed was forestalled in that course, and the use of the Fathers was incidentally proved in various particulars, whilst I was more immediately engaged in relieving them from abuse. Such was especially the case with respect to questions involved in the Romish controversy; most of which have already passed in review whilst I was in fact engaged in answering Daillé and Barbeyrac. I shall endeavour, therefore, not to repeat myself in this continuation of my remarks, and omit such proofs of

the value of the Fathers as have already been offered under the other head of my subject.

Now, if we contemplate them in relation to the *Evidences* for the truth of our religion, it would be difficult to overrate their worth. It is obvious, that the very period at which they lived, would be enough in itself to make their testimony most precious. Whatever gives us a better command of the circumstances under which Christianity established itself in the world improves the field of evidence. For a vast number of infidel arguments are founded on ignorance or imperfect information of primitive times. I feel that the matter which belongs to this single branch of the subject is so overwhelming that I cannot attempt to produce a tithe of it. My object, indeed, is not to exhaust any of the topics I handle; the limits, within which these Lectures must be compressed, would not admit of it. All I can do is, to adduce so much proof as shall satisfy my hearers that I have a reason for what I say; and encourage them to pursue the further investigation of the subject for themselves.

Thus it has always been considered a very strong argument for the truth of the Christian religion, that though backed by no secular power whatever, and propagated by a few unlettered fishermen, it should have so soon made a lodgement in the world, overrun the nations so wonderfully fast as it did, till it made kings proud to be its nursing-fathers, and queens its nursing-mothers. But suppose to this it was replied that the assertion was not true—that it did not in fact begin to take possession of the earth till it became the religion of the empire, and was accordingly upheld by secular authority, and owed, indeed, its success to secular support—how is the objection to be met, but by an appeal to early Christian history? The objection itself is no imaginary one, you are well aware, but in the hands of a subtle historian has been no doubt made instrumental to shaking the faith of thousands: the rather because Gibbon lived at a time when few, if even any, scholars knew much about primitive ecclesiastical antiquity. Indeed, I can scarcely imagine he would have ventured on the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of his book in their present form, had not the theology of his age invited him to run risks, and take liberties with truth. For how ample is the testimony borne by the Fathers of the first three centuries to the wide dis-

persion of the Gospel even then. It transpires perpetually; not directly only, but often in a manner the most circuitous and incidental—in such a manner as could only result from the fact itself being a settled conviction in the writer's mind.

Thus Clemens (even so early a witness as he) having occasion to produce some examples of the virtue of patience in support of his exhortation to the Corinthian Church to encourage it in themselves, mentions St. Paul. "Seven times," says he, "he was in bonds, he was scourged, he was stoned, he preached both in the east and in the west, leaving behind him a glorious report of his faith: and so, having taught the whole world righteousness, and having travelled even to the utmost bounds of the west, he at last suffered martyrdom."[1]

Again, Justin Martyr tells us that the bells attached to the high priest's garment were a figure of the twelve Apostles who were dependent on Christ the Priest for ever; the *whole earth* through their preaching having been filled with the glory and grace of God and of his Christ. Wherefore it was that David said, "Their sound is gone out into all lands, and their words into the ends of the world."[2] Here we have another instance of the fact we are investigating, being communicated in the same unobtrusive way as before. Again, in the same author's exposition of Moses' blessing on Joseph, "his horns are like the horns of an unicorn, with them he shall push the people together to the ends of the earth,"[3] the horn of the unicorn is the Cross, and its pushing the nations to the ends of the earth is but significant, says he, "of what has already come to pass *among all nations*. For they of all nations, pushed by the horn, that is, pricked to the heart by this mystery, have turned from their vain idols to the worship of God."[4]

Once more, Irenæus in commenting on the parable of the grain of mustard seed, remarks that in that parable, "the Judge of the whole world was announced—that he, in the heart of the earth and buried in the tomb, in three days became the greatest of trees, and stretched forth His branches to the ends of the world—that the twelve Apostles, shooting from the stem, like goodly and flourishing boughs, became a shelter for the nations, as those boughs are to the birds of

[1] Clem. Rom. Ad Cor. I. § v.
[2] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 42.
[3] Deut. xxxiii. 17.
[4] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 91.

heaven; under which boughs, all finding shelter, like birds gathered into the nest, have partaken of that food nutritious and heavenly which proceeded from them."[1] It is most improbable that Irenæus would have used expressions of this sort, if the Gospel had not actually made great progress when he penned them. Again, he is speaking of the uniformity of tradition in the orthodox Church, to whatever branch of it you turn, as presenting an insuperable objection to the novelties of the heretics. That is his argument; but in treating it, he incidentally touches on the actual superficial extent of that Church in the following terms; "so that the faith and tradition of the Churches is one and the same, whether they be established in Germany, in Spain, in Gaul, in the East, in Egypt, in Libya, or in the middle of the world."[2] And here may be the proper place for remarking by the way the animus with which Gibbon handles such early evidence as this for the wide dispersion of the Gospel. We see Spain is one of the countries here enumerated as having received the Gospel, and in such a measure as to have her Churches appealed to on the subject of Tradition; a circumstance indicating both that the spread of the Gospel in that country was considerable, and also that its date was even then of some standing. And yet Gibbon casts a doubt upon the Gospel having penetrated Spain even in Tertullian's time, whose testimony to that effect he produces in order to disparage it, as if it was the earliest which existed on the question, altogether sinking this of Irenæus which preceded Tertullian's and concurred with it. "From Gaul," says Gibbon, "which claimed a just pre-eminence of learning and authority over all the countries on this side of the Alps, the light of the Gospel was more faintly reflected on the remote provinces of Spain and Britain; and if we may credit the vehement assertions of Tertullian,[3] they had already received the first rays of the faith, when he addressed his Apology to the magistrates of the Emperor Severus."[4] Now, why advert to a rhetorical passage of Tertullian, a later witness, and suppress this sober one of Irenæus, an earlier? I say suppress, because though not taking the slightest notice of it in his *text*, where if Tertullian was

[1] Irenæus, Fragm. xxxi. or p. 347, Bened. Ed.
[2] Irenæus, I. c. x. § 2.
[3] Tertullian, Adv. Judæos, c. vii.
[4] Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. ii. p. 368.

worth producing, surely Irenæus was, he has a reference to it afterwards in a note [1]; in a note, however, annexed to a sentence which has no particular relation to Spain, and the reference in that note confined to a bare citation of the book and chapter of Irenæus, without a word about the substance of the passage referred to, nothing in short done to invite us to examine it; as though on the one hand, Gibbon was reluctant to put his readers in full possession of an authority which was against him; and on the other, was willing to prepare for himself a retreat against the charge of ignorance of that authority, by barely jotting down the chapter and verse. The very next page furnishes an instance of the same disingenuousness in the case of *Armenia*. "It will still remain an undoubted fact, that the barbarians of Scythia and Germany, who afterwards subverted the Roman monarchy, were involved in the darkness of Paganism; and that even the conversion of Iberia, of Armenia, and of Æthiopia, was not attempted with any degree of success till the sceptre was in the hands of an orthodox emperor." [2] But Armenia is one of the nations expressly enumerated by Tertullian [3] as believing in Christ, and Mr. Gibbon himself, convinced that in this case at least his assertion was not true, expressed his intention of correcting his error in future editions.[4] "Yet," remarks Professor Porson in the Preface to his Letters to Archdeacon Travis, a Preface in which he pronounces an eulogium with certain exceptions on Mr. Gibbon's history, "to say the truth, I have one censure in reserve. A candid acknowledgment of error does not seem to be Mr. Gibbon's shining virtue. He promised (if I understand him rightly) that in a future edition he would expunge the words, *of Armenia*, or make an equivalent alteration. A new edition has appeared; but I have looked in vain to find a correction of that passage." [5]

But to return to our proof that the early Fathers bear testimony to the wide dispersion of the Gospel in their time; that of Tertullian, which has already been advanced in one instance, does not terminate with that one; on the contrary, it presents itself in many of his works, written no

[1] Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vol. ii. p. 369, note 177.
[2] p. 369.
[3] Tertullian, Adversus Judæos, c. vii.
[4] Gibbon's Miscellaneous Works, vol. iv. p. 577. 8vo. 1814.
[5] Porson's Letters to Travis, p. xxxi.

doubt at considerable intervals of time. One while he tells us, as in his Apology, that people were exclaiming, the state was besieged by the Christians; that it was deplored as a misfortune, that every sex, age, condition, rank, was passing over to their name.[1] At another time he talks of the Christians, however unobtrusive their lives, in numbers constituting the major part of every state.[2] Elsewhere he produces a catalogue of distinguished princes, and shows that they after all only governed limited districts, Solomon, *e. g.* from Dan to Beersheba, "whereas the kingdom and name of Christ extends everywhere, is believed everywhere, is worshipped by all the nations already enumerated;"[3] those nations being "the Parthians, Medes, Elamites, the dwellers in Mesopotamia, in Armenia, in Phrygia, in Cappadocia, the inhabitants of Pontus, Asia, and Pamphylia; of Egypt and of the country of Africa about Cyrene; Romans, Jews, the various tribes of the Getuli, many districts of the Moors; the whole boundary of Spain; divers nations of the Gauls; and parts of Britain which had been inaccessible to the Romans."[4] And on another occasion, when arguing that the prophecies which related to the events that were to follow the appearance of Christ, were fulfilled after Jesus of Nazareth, he proceeds, "for behold all the nations emerging out of the vortex of human error, to God the Creator and to God the Christ;" and then having quoted the Psalm, "I shall give thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy possession," he observes that this prediction was not accomplished in David, whose empire was limited to Judæa, but in Christ, "who hath already possessed," says he, "the whole world with a faith in his Gospel."[5] Some of the treatises in which these passages occur were composed before he was a Montanist; some afterwards; some in which there is no internal evidence to show whether it was before or after; but all of them, we see, concur in the assertion of the extensive dispersion of the Gospel in his time.

Origen in his turn speaks to the same effect. In his treatise against Celsus, one of the works of his maturer age, and perhaps the most sober of them all, in replying to the objection that Christianity is but of yesterday's date, he

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. i.
[2] Ad Scapulam, c. ii.
[3] Adversus Judæos, c. vii.
[4] Ibid.
[5] Adversus Marcionem, III. c. xx.

draws a conclusion in favour of Christianity from this very circumstance; that recent as was its introduction among men, it had made a progress, which nothing could account for but its Divine origin. "And though at the first," says he, "the kings of the day, and the chief officers under them, and the magistrates, and in short all who were in any post of authority, and the governors in cities, and the military, and the populace, resisted the dispersion of it over the world, it still prevailed, for it could not be hindered, as being the Word of God, and stronger than all its antagonists; so that it took possession of the whole of Greece, and the greater part of the world of the barbarians, and converted myriads of souls to that form of worship."[1] And again, in the same treatise, when showing how faithfully our Lord's prediction was fulfilled, that the Gospel should "be preached in all the world for a witness unto all nations,"[2] Origen remarks, "Who that reverts to the time when Jesus used these words, will not wonder when he perceives that according to them the Gospel of Jesus Christ has been preached in all the world under heaven, to Greeks and barbarians, to wise and foolish? For the Word spoke with power that prevailed over the whole race of mankind; and one can find no nation amongst them, which has escaped receiving the doctrine of Jesus."[3] And on another occasion in the same treatise, he considers the Churches established all the world over, in every city, as ordained to be the antagonists and correctives of the heathen assemblies (ἐκκλησίαι the term applied to both), and challenges a comparison between their respective leaders and governors.[4] So again in his De Principiis, and in a part of that treatise where the Greek is preserved, so that the testimony cannot be that of Rufinus, who might be supposed to speak of the condition of Christianity at a later date, the argument and almost the language is the same. "And if we consider, how in a *very few years* (ἐν σφόδρα ὀλίγοις ἔτεσι), whilst those who confessed Christianity were plotted against, and some of them were slain for it, and others were spoiled of their property, and though the teachers of it were not very numerous, the Word

[1] Πάσης μὲν Ἑλλάδος, ἐπὶ πλεῖον δὲ τῆς βαρβάρου ἐκράτησε, καὶ μετεποί ησε μυρίας ὅσας ψυχὰς επὶ τὴν κατ' αὐτὸν θεοσέβειαν.—Origen, Contra Celsum, I. § 28.

[2] Matt. xxiv. 14.

[3] Contra Celsum, II. § 13.

[4] III. § 30.

found means to be proclaimed *everywhere throughout the world*, so that Greeks and barbarians, wise and foolish, were added to the religion of Jesus, we cannot hesitate to affirm that the thing was above what was of man."[1] Jacob's prophecy, he afterwards argues, is seen to be fulfilled "by the multitude of the nations who have believed in God through Christ,"[2] and also that in Psalm lxxii. 8. "His dominion shall be also from the one sea to the other, and from the flood unto the world's end."[3]

Again, Cyprian in his tract addressed to Demetrianus, a heathen scoffer, still leads us to the same conclusion. The very charge which this antagonist alleges against the Christians is in itself a proof of their numbers. The greater frequency of wars, the greater severity of plague and famine, the long lack of rain and showers were calamities, it seems, according to him, which were imputed to the Christians.[4] But there would have been nothing even plausible in such an accusation as this, unless the Christians had been so large a portion of the population as materially to affect the number of the worshippers of the heathen gods. And in fact, Cyprian in the course of this essay, hints that the Christians are so formidable a body, that though it was their custom and their glory to take the persecution they suffered, patiently, they were in strength to resent it. "Therefore, it is, that none of us when apprehended resists, none rises against your unjust violence, quamvis nimius et copiosus noster sit populus."[5] And a modest expression in Minucius Felix, perhaps, does not indicate the same fact the less forcibly on account of its unpretending character. "Neither let us pride ourselves upon our numbers, seeing that in the sight of God, before whom the whole world is stretched out, we are few."[6]

It is not, however, merely on phrases of this kind which escape from the Fathers, one and all, that we build; though, considering how uniform their language is upon this point, and how distant from one another are the parties in many instances when they use it, such concurrence in them is in itself very satisfactory; but the *facts*, which these early documents furnish, establish the same conclusion. Asia

[1] De Principiis, IV. § 2.
[2] § 3.
[3] § 5.
[4] Cyprian, Ad Demetrianum, § ii.
[5] § xvii.
[6] Minucius Felix, Octav. c. xxxiii.

Minor was evidently full of Christian communities. The epistles of Ignatius testify it. For though those epistles are addressed directly to five Churches only of that country, yet it is evident that there were in it numbers besides. These five happened to lie on or near the march of Ignatius, when he was conveyed from Antioch to Rome, and so were honoured by his more immediate notice. But he speaks of Churches which did not belong to him forwarding him on his journey city by city[1]; and tells Polycarp that as he has not been able to write himself to all the Churches, he trusts he will do it for him to such as were in his own neighbourhood.[2] Indeed, as on the one hand, several of the Churches to which Ignatius appeals are not mentioned in the Revelation; so on the other, several of those mentioned in the Revelation are not found in the list of the Ignatian Churches. Then, Polycrates, a Bishop of Ephesus in the second century, writes a synodical epistle to Victor, Bishop of Rome, on the subject of Easter,[3] of which epistle a fragment is come down to us in Eusebius. Now in this fragment it is said, that if the names of the Bishops assembled at that convocation were put down, they would be found to be great multitudes (πολλὰ πλήθη). The same ecclesiastical history contains a portion of an epistle addressed by Serapion, a Bishop of Antioch of the same date, to Rhossus, a city of Cilicia, on the subject of a spurious Gospel of St. Peter[4]; and mention is made in it too of a Bishop of Hierapolis in Phrygia. Again, the epistle from the Churches of Lyons and Vienne is written to the Churches of Asia and Phrygia; not merely showing that Churches there were in Asia and Phrygia, but vigorous Churches, Churches holding close connection with the Churches of Gaul, and deeply interested in their sufferings—all this still within the second century.[5] The work of Irenæus who was eventually Bishop of Lyons, as he had been previously Presbyter of the same Church, gives us the impression of having been composed in a country where the Gospel was not weak even then, or confined to very narrow bounds. It bespeaks its author not to be buried alive in a corner of the Church, but to be master of all the great heresies of the day. And though it is true he had

[1] Ignatius, Ad Rom. § ix.
[2] Ad Polycarpum, § viii.
[3] Routh. Rel. Sacr. vol. i. p. 369.
[4] p. 470.
[5] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. cc. 1, 2, 3.

visited Rome, and no doubt kept up an intercourse with the East, yet the book was composed in Gaul; and though in the preface of it he apologizes for his style, on the plea that he was living among Celts, and was in the habit, therefore, of using a barbarous language, he makes no allusion to any other disadvantage which his position entailed upon him; and it is manifest that he is combating an evil even at his own doors, certain of these Gnostics having been busy even in his own district about the Rhone[1]; the proximity of the mischief probably stimulating him to write against and expose them; but there scarcely would have been vigorous heresies subsisting in a country where the Church had not made effectual lodgement. The frequent allusions too, which we find in him, to ritual and ecclesiastical organization lead to the same conclusion. Indeed, we shall presently see, that by the time of Cyprian there is evidence indisputable, that there were numerous sees in Gaul. Again, fragments of writers of the second century, preserved by Eusebius, still continue to afford occasional glimpses of this wide dispersion of the Gospel over districts I have not yet touched; nor can we read them without feeling, how much evidence on this question must have perished together with the early Christian documents which contained it, and without lamenting the loss of them for this as for many other reasons. Thus Dionysius, a Bishop of Corinth of that period, writes Catholic epistles to the Lacedæmonians, to the Athenians, to the Nicomedians, to Gortyna and the Gnossians, Churches in Crete, as well as to Churches in other regions of which I have spoken already.[2] And Serapion, whilst communicating with two correspondents on the subject of the Montanists, incidentally speaks of a Bishop of Debeltum in Thrace, and also of a Bishop of Anchialus in the same country. But what need is there to pick up the state of religion in Greece piecemeal? Tertullian in a manner the most incidental, for when he writes he is a Montanist, and is engaged in defending the assemblies of the Montanists, extra-scriptural though they might be—Tertullian in self-defence tells us that "Councils of all the Churches (*i. e.* the orthodox Churches) were held in stated places throughout Greece (per Græcias), at which all weightier matters were discussed; and the representation of the whole Christian com-

[1] Irenæus, I. c. xiii. § 7.

[2] Rel. Sacr. vol. i. p. 170.

munity took place with vast solemnity."[1] Irenæus twice refers to the Church in Æthiopia as first established by the eunuch,[2] and in such terms as would indicate that it could then be appealed to for the orthodox doctrine, that no other God was taught by the Apostles save God the Father, nor any Christ but Jesus. What stronger proof again is it possible to have of the vigorous condition of Christianity at Alexandria and in that region, than the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus afford, or those of Origen who succeeded him for a time? The greater part of the works of both these authors, and especially of the former and earlier, is characteristic not merely of the Gospel having taken the deepest root among all classes, but even of very refined and transcendental views of it prevailing amongst them—so far was it even then from being in the cradle of its existence in that district. And once in possession of Alexandria and its schools, what could stop its wide and rapid diffusion over the world? For if there was one place more than another calculated as a propitious starting-point for a new doctrine, it was Alexandria. Its position secured full and free intercourse with Asia, Africa, and Europe; and it seems to have been a neutral ground on which all sects and opinions met together—Eastern sophists who probably introduced by that channel their Gnostic doctrines into circulation in the West, Platonists, Jews in very great numbers, speculative teachers of all sorts, abounding there; and the great library of the Ptolemies furnishing magazines of materials for all. In a society such as this, would not Clemens have been exposing himself to ridicule in the use of such language as the following, if he spoke without good grounds for what he said? He is encouraging the heathen to embrace the truth by reminding them that they might infer the Gospel to be from God by reason of the rapidity with which it had overrun the world. "The power of God," says he, "illuminating the earth with amazing speed and a benevolence within the reach of all hath *filled the universe*, (ἐνέπλησε τὸ πᾶν,) with the seed of salvation. For the Lord did not achieve so great a work as this in so short a time without the Divine Providence. . . . He was the true wrestler, and wrestled in conjunction with the creature; and very quickly *distributed to all mankind* (τάχιστα δὲ

[1] Tertullian, De Jejuniis, c. xiii. [2] Irenæus, III. c. xii. § 8; IV. c. xxiii. § 2.

εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους διαδοθεὶς), and rising according to his Father's will more swiftly than the sun," (the wrestler probably referring to the giant, to whom the sun is compared in the 19th Psalm,) "he readily made the Godhead to shine upon us, showing us whence he was and who he was by the things which he taught and exhibited; the Maker of the Covenant, the Reconciler, our Saviour the Word, the Fountain which giveth life, which giveth peace, Himself poured *over the whole face of the earth*; through whom in short *all things are become a sea of good*."[1] So much for Alexandria and that region. Again, what a surface does Cyprian represent directly and indirectly as occupied by Christianity. He talks to Stephanus of Faustinus, a Bishop of Lyons, and of the other brother Bishops of the same province.[2] He communicates with the Clergy and people of Spain[3]; with Firmilianus, a Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia,[4] in which latter communication the elders and overseers of the Church are described as meeting together once a year to settle grave matters at a common Council.[5] And he actually assembles no less than 87 Bishops at Carthage from the province of Africa, Numidia, and Mauritania, to discuss the subject of heretical Baptism.[6]

In short, the evidence on this question derived from the early Fathers alone can leave no doubt, that the countries bordering on the Mediterranean and Euxine seas were full of Christians long before Constantine was born. And is it possible to believe, that occupying such a region as this, the choicest that can be imagined for commanding the world, it could be confined to it? Indeed, there is proof that it was not. Such a document, *e. g.* as the spurious letter of King Abgarus to Jesus given in Eusebius,[7] being in itself enough to show that Christianity had been established from an ancient date in the kingdoms beyond the Euphrates: as the memorandum in Hippolytus of the countries, to which the Apostles were scattered, bespeaks the same fact; for it assigns India to Bartholomew, and Albanus a city in Armenia for the scene of his martyrdom; to Thomas it gives Parthia, Media, Persia,

[1] Clem. Alex. Cohort. § x. p. 86.

[2] Cæteris coepiscopis nostris in eâdem provinciâ constitutis.—Cyprian, Ep. lxvii. § i.

[3] Ep. lxviii.

[4] Ep. lxxv.

[5] § 4.

[6] Concil. Carthag. sub Cypriano, VII. Procem.

[7] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. i. c. 13.

Hyrcania, the Bactri, the Mardi, and Calamina, a city of India, for the place where he suffered death; to Lebbæus Mesopotamia[1]: as a passage of Origen gives Scythia to St. Andrew.[2] And whatever may have been the authority on which such tradition rested, there can be no doubt that when these documents were written which have preserved it, Christianity must have extended itself to the countries enumerated in them as the fields of the Apostles' labours.[3] And numerous touches of early ecclesiastical history found in Eusebius all support the same conclusion.[4]

The manner, in which the Gospel actually worked its way over the earth, is not easily traced. It came not of observation. The direct preaching of the missionary, though the obvious, was probably very far from being the only, or perhaps even the most ordinary channel; an expression which drops from Origen in a passage I have already cited, perhaps intimates as much—the rapid dispersion of the Gospel marking its Divine origin, says he, the more, as the number of its teachers was limited.[5] Justin Martyr finds a prediction of the unobtrusive character of the advent of the Gospel in the Lord smiting Amalek with a *secret hand* (*ἐν χειρὶ κρυφαίᾳ,*)[6] and certainly this expression is very indicative of its noiseless yet effectual course. It was so from the very beginning. When Paul approaches Italy the first time, he finds it already inhabited by many Christians. The brethren at Puteoli desire him to tarry with them; and the brethren from Rome come to meet him. How or when they had been converted to the Gospel is a mystery. Again, the interval between his release from his first confinement at Rome and his return to that place is uncertain, it might be three years, or it might be more.[7]

[1] Hippolytus, De Duodecim Apostolis, Ed. Fabr. Append. p. 30.

[2] Origen, vol. ii. p. 24, Bened. Ed.

[3] Eusebius enumerates several of Hippolytus' works; and though this memorandum is not specified amongst them, he says that there were very many other writings of his in different hands, *πλεῖστά τε ἄλλα καὶ παρὰ πολλοῖς εὗροις ἂν σωζόμενα.*—Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 22.

[4] *E. g.* he speaks of Pantænus having penetrated even to India, and of Bartholomew having preceded him, as report said.—Eccles. Hist. v. c. 10.

[5] *Οὐδὲ τῶν διδασκάλων πλεοναζόντων.*—Origen, De Principiis, IV. § 2. This may possibly refer to the number of the first Apostles. Compare IV. § 5.

[6] So the LXX. Exod. xvii. 16.

[7] Lardner releases him from Rome in the early part of 63, and puts him to death in 65. Credibility, Part II. Supplement, c. xi. §§ xi. xii. Cave makes the former date 59, the latter 63, Hist. Lit. p. 6; Burton, the former 58, the latter 67 or 68, Hist. of the Christian Church, pp. 203. 241, 3rd Ed.; Pearson, the former 63, the latter 68,

But how active seems to have been the progress of the Gospel there during that interval; an interval during which this great Apostle himself at least, having been absent from Rome, could not personally have contributed to the movement, yet, I say, how active does its progress seem to have been during that brief interval! *Both* St. Paul's visits were made during the reign of the same emperor, Nero; yet how different is the reception at the one and at the other! In the first he "was suffered to dwell by himself with a soldier that kept him," "to dwell in his own hired house, and to receive all that came in unto him;" and then he made a favourable impression on some even "of Cæsar's houshold."[1] In the second he "suffered trouble, as an evil doer, even unto bonds,"[2] he was "ready to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand;"[3] and in accordance with these anticipations of his own, he was actually put to death. For the success of the Gospel had been such within this short space of time, that the powers of the empire, indifferent to it in the first instance, had meanwhile taken alarm; and it had begun to be perceived that Gallio's view of the question at any rate could no longer be maintained. Yet how silently had the leaven been working all this while. Justin tells us the history of his own conversion: it was apparently quite accidental, as we should say. He had retired to a secluded region near the coast for the indulgence of uninterrupted meditation, being then engaged in the study of Plato's philosophy. Here an old man of mild and venerable aspect, who was on the look-out for some friends whom he had lost, met with him and fell into conversation with him. He proved to be a Christian; and accordingly in the course of the dialogue which ensued between them, he drew Justin's attention to the Scriptures, and to the dispensation of the Gospel, of which they spake; and, his discourse ended, he went away, and Justin saw him no more. Yet the effects of this encounter did not terminate here.[4] This casual adventure had predisposed Justin to examine the Scriptures; and having done so, he became converted and a Christian. Probably this is the history of thousands. There is another account of a conversion in

Minor Theological Works, vol. i. pp. 391, 396.

[1] Philippians iv. 22.

[2] 2 Tim. ii. 9.

[3] iv. 6.

[4] Justin Martyr, Dial. §§ 3–8.

Minucius Felix—indeed it forms the plot of his Dialogue—which again may be considered characteristic of the incidental manner in which it was effected in numberless instances. Minucius tells us that there was nothing, which he remembered of his friend Octavius (whose name gives the title to his little work) so vividly, as a conversation which Octavius had held with one Cæcilius a heathen, at which he was himself present; a conversation at which Octavius won Cæcilius to the Gospel.[1] This Cæcilius, it happened, had come to Rome on a visit to Minucius; and after they had spent a few days there together in talking over old times, they all three repaired to Ostia for sea-bathing, Minucius having occasion to recruit his health, and the vacation during the short vintage having caused the courts to be shut, for Minucius was a lawyer. Here it chanced, as they were pacing the shore, that on passing an image of Serapis, Cæcilius put his hand to his lip and saluted it, as was the practice with the superstitious vulgar.[2] Whereupon, says Octavius to Minucius, "it is not the part of a good man, my brother, to allow his friend and companion to continue in such darkness, as that he should be left to stumble against a stone in broad day—a stone fashioned, and anointed, and crowned with garlands, it is true—seeing that the disgrace falls upon you as much as upon him." Meanwhile, the party pursued their walk along the shore in desultory conversation; and as they returned paused, where the boats were drawn up on the beach, to watch some boys playing at ducks and drakes on the surface of the water.[3] Whilst they were amusing themselves with looking at the sport, Minucius remarked that Cæcilius took no interest in it, but, on the contrary, was silent and thoughtful. What ails you? said he. I am annoyed, replied Cæcilius, at the observation of Octavius, which conveyed to me a reproach of ignorance. Now I am prepared to debate this subject with him, and I will show him that it is an easier matter to babble among friends than to argue with philosophers. Suppose, therefore, we seat ourselves on the mole, and discuss the question. Accordingly they took their places, and the argument proceeded.[4] I have produced the passage somewhat at full, because all the details of it answer the purpose for which I cite it; viz. to point out the very casual manner in which the Gospel was often propagated, and

[1] Minucius Felix, Octav. c. i. [2] c. ii. [3] c. iii. [4] c. iv.

the multitude of channels it was stealing through, besides the direct one of missionary exertions. The accidental visit of the heathen to his friend at Rome—their going together to the coast at vacation time, all of them, perhaps, being lawyers, one of them certainly being so—the passing salutation of the image—the apparatus so different from a pulpit and a congregation—the whole, I mean, serving to show, what numerous springs of all sorts were in motion to disperse Christianity, and to account for the very rapid progress it made; so many hands, it appears, forwarding it who were not expressly charged with the work, nor even suspected of being engaged in it.

Moreover, the very nature of Christianity was such as to excite attention and awake discussion wherever it planted itself. It was a disturbing force. It could not exist, and not make itself felt. Even so early as the Canonical Epistles, one detects this feature of it. From a passage in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, we find there was already felt to be a difficulty about carrying on legal suits, when the tribunal was heathen and the litigants Christian. "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust?"[1] In the same Epistle (for the social character of many of the questions handled in that Epistle causes it to supply us with much evidence of the qualities there were in the Gospel to make it talked about), in that same Epistle, I say, we have another contingency provided for, which must have been of constant occurrence, that of unequal marriage, one party a believer, the other an infidel.[2] What a fruitful field of discussion would either of these occurrences furnish, the one bringing the question of Christianity under consideration in all its bearings on property and person, the other in all its bearings on the social relations of life. And it is this view of the *stirring* nature of the Gospel, the vibration, as it were, which it occasioned throughout the system into which it was admitted, that is, perhaps, the true key to a passage in the Epistle to the Philippians, often quoted for another purpose. "But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the Gospel (*i. e.* his imprisonment); so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all

[1] 1 Cor. vi. 1. [2] 1 Cor. vii. 12, 13.

other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear. Some, indeed, preach (κηρύσσουσιν) Christ even of envy and strife; and some also of good will: the one preach Christ of contention, not sincerely, supposing to add affliction to my bonds: but the other of love, knowing that I am set for the defence of the Gospel. What then? notwithstanding, every way, whether in pretence or in truth, Christ is preached (καταγγέλλεται); and therein do I rejoice, yea, and will rejoice"[1]—the terms κηρύσσω and καταγγέλλω not used in any *technical* sense, I apprehend, or having here the meaning of *preach* as usually understood; but simply conveying the idea, that St. Paul's imprisonment had excited a strong sensation (as we say in these days), and led to the discussion of the merits of the cause for which he suffered; one party assailing and vilifying it and him, and another party warmly defending both; and thus both parties, whether actuated by spite or by charity still serving by their disputes to spread the knowledge of Christ and to proclaim Him; a good result at all events, in which St. Paul rejoices. The passage, thus explained, holds out no sanction for heretical preaching, as it is often made to do. These commotions, which attended on the progress of the Gospel, and which we thus see had begun in the Apostles' days, increased in an enormous ratio, as it proceeded and gathered strength; and by consequence interfered more and more with all the habits, and arrangements, and laws, and occupations, and amusements of mankind: so that the subject soon forced itself upon all who came within the range of its influence, whether they would or not: it could not be blinked; and thus overran the world with a rapidity, which nothing could stop. The absence of the Christians from all public spectacles,[2] from executions,[3] their scruples about wearing garlands at a feast,[4] and ointments[5]; their care about their own poor[6]; their hesitation to take a heathen oath[7]; their reluctance to burn their dead[8]; their refusal to partake of meats which had

[1] Philippians i. 12–18.
[2] Clem. Alex. Pæd. III. c. xi. p. 298.
[3] Athenagoras, Leg. pro Christianis, § 35.
[4] Clem. Alex. Pæd. II. c. viii. p. 213.
[5] p. 205.
[6] Stromat. I. § i. p. 319.
[7] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xvii.
[8] De Coronâ, c. xi.; Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, Routh. Rel. Sacr. vol. i. p. 290.

been offered at heathen altars[1]; their objections to having their children taught at school heathen mythology[2]; their use on all occasions of the sign of the Cross,[3] on their beds, on their persons; all these peculiarities and numbers more of the same kind, great and small, which might be mentioned, must have been so many challenges to the curiosity of the world they mixed with; must have drawn attention to them and their doctrines: the feeling which accompanied their march, go where they would, must have been more or less that of the people of Thessalonica, "these that have turned the world upside down are come hither also."[4] We saw from Minucius, that the casual salutation of an image of Serapis was the primary cause of a discussion on the merits of Christianity and of the conversion which ensued; how much more likely would the casual crossing of the person (to take the least of the peculiarities of the Christians I enumerated) be a trifle calculated to lead to similar results!

The ordinary progress of the Gospel promoted through all these unobtrusive channels, must have been greatly accelerated by the frequent resort of the people in those days, in multitudes, to the public games. The mere union of persons from all quarters with little to do, whilst the games lasted, but to talk over the events of the day, was propitious to the diffusion of the knowledge of this rising sect. The case was similar in this respect to the feast of the Passover, and the effects were similar. We learn from St. John the active inquiries, which were made about Jesus by the crowds assembled at that feast. "Many went out of the country up to Jerusalem before the Passover," and they "spake among themselves as they stood in the temple, what think ye, that he will not come to the feast?"[5] But in the case of these shows, there were other reasons why this topic, the dispersion of Christianity, should be eagerly and zealously discussed at them; such seasons being often chosen for the execution of the Christians, none other being better suited for making a public example. Thus we read, that the soldiers who had the custody of Ignatius were not content with simply discharging their office and conveying him to Rome, but were anxious to do so "before the

[1] Minucius Felix, Octav. c. xxxviii.
[2] c. xxii.
[3] Tertullian, Ad Uxorem, II. c. v.
[4] Acts xvii. 6.
[5] John xi. 55, 56.

games were over;"[1] and it was at a great festival of this kind at Smyrna, that Polycarp was burned.[2] And the voice which issued from aloft, when the old man entered the arena, "Be of good heart, and play the man, Polycarp," sustained as it was by the courageous carriage of the martyr, probably preached a sermon which made more converts, and circulated far more widely than appeared—lighted up a candle which would not readily be put out.

[1] Acts of Ignatius, § v. considered genuine by Pearson, Vind. Ign. Part I. cc. v., vi.

[2] Acts of Polycarp, § ix.

LECTURE II.

The insinuation of Gibbon respecting the *rank and character* of the early Christians, originally advanced by the heathen opponents of Christianity, and answered by the Apologists. The fact, that many persons of wealth and education were Christians, proved, from the acquirements of the Fathers, from their specific assertion of it, from their addressing themselves to the rich and intelligent, from the fund at the disposal of the Church. Variety of demands upon the pecuniary resources of the Christians. Remarks on the Libellatici.

WE saw in the last Lecture that the authority of the Fathers tends to establish the fact, that the Gospel was dispersed very widely indeed before Constantine, and that the numbers of the Christians were already very great; an inference to which they cannot minister without fairly winning for themselves our esteem, as being at least valuable contributors to the Evidences. But they have further claims on us of the same kind from the light they throw on the rank, condition, and character of the early Christians, a point to the illustration of which, I am anxious to make these Lectures tributary. For the sceptic, you are well aware, has used this weapon against the faith, and insinuated, that they consisted "almost entirely of the dregs of the populace, of peasants and mechanics, of boys and women, of beggars and slaves"; and that accordingly the Christian missionaries were as "loquacious and dogmatical in private", as they were slow to encounter philosophers and persons of education in debate.[1]

Now in the first place this accusation is almost or altogether founded on information supplied by the Fathers themselves; and it is scarcely credible that they would have volunteered it, had they thought it formidable to the cause they advocated. It has come down to us, in fact, as an objection found by them in infidel publications, to which they are replying, and which their replies have so far preserved, or as an objection, which in the treatises they sometimes drew up in the form of dialogues, they put into the mouths of their ignorant adver-

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 372.

saries. Origen, *e. g.* gives it to Celsus in more places than one[1]; and Minucius Felix assigns it almost in the terms I have stated it in, and which are nearly those of Gibbon, to Cæcilius the Heathen antagonist of his friend Octavius.[2] I need scarcely tell you, how very ill-informed on the affairs of the Christians these heathens are represented to have been; and how apt they were to undertake to refute them, without giving themselves any previous pains to master the character and tenets of those they were bent on overthrowing. Justin complains of this in the case of Crescens. The description he gives of him is this: "It is not fit to call the man a philosopher," says he, "testifying against us, as he does, publicly, facts of which he knows nothing; charging the Christians with being atheists and impious persons; and acting thus in order to curry favour with the multitude who have been led astray. For if he calumniates us without having read the precepts of Christ, he is utterly base, and worse than the boors; for they generally have scruples about talking and telling lies on subjects with which they are unacquainted. Or if he has read them, then he does not understand the majesty there is in them. Or if he understands this, and acts as he does in order that no suspicion may attach to himself, he is still more infamous and mean; for he is truckling to an ignorant and senseless prejudice, and to fear."[3] And Theophilus makes a similar complaint of Autolycus, the friend to whom he addresses his defence of the Christians; very greatly surprised that one who spared no pains in mastering all the profane and worthless books that came out, would give himself no trouble about the Christian writings[4]; and though, in other matters, he was so curious as to investigate them all with the utmost care, he should feel no concern about Christianity.[5] And Origen expresses himself in very similar terms of Celsus, alleging that "whoever would examine the uniform purport of our Scriptures, would perceive that Celsus, whose hatred to the Christians was like that of the most ignorant vulgar, brought these charges of his against them without inquiry or regard for truth."[6] It need not therefore be a case for wonder, if, under such circumstances,

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 44.
[2] Minucius Felix, c. viii.
[3] Justin Martyr. Apol. II. § 3.
[4] Theophilus ad Autolycum, III. § 1
[5] § 4.
[6] Ἀνεξετάστως καὶ ψευδόμενος.—Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 58. See also V. § 20. Κέλσου μήτε νοήσαντος τὸ παρ' ἡμῖν γεγραμμένον, μήτε κρίναι δυναμένου, κ.τ.λ.

we find many idle imputations cast upon the Christians, and much exaggeration and distortion of features, that might really in some degree belong to them, attempted. For philosophers, it seems, to which class all these men belonged,[1] were in no other way difficult to deal with, than as they were totally ignorant of the subject they were disputing about. Certainly, the canonical Scriptures of the New Testament imply that in the first instance Christians were in general, though by no means exclusively, of the poorer ranks; and Origen, in replying to this charge, for it is one which Celsus advances, remarks on one of these occasions when he does so, that it must needs be so, inasmuch as the ignorant and uneducated being more in number than the literate, there must be among the multitudes converted to Christianity, more ignorant and uneducated persons than intelligent ones; but he adds, that even Celsus confessed that there were temperate and gentle, and understanding persons among them, and persons capable of penetrating allegories,[2] that though the Churches had *few* wise men (*σοφοὺς*) who abandoned that wisdom which was after the flesh to come to them, yet that such persons they had who left the carnal for the divine[3]: and in another passage in the same treatise he inverts the objection, and in language bespeaking in a very remarkable manner the impression the Gospel had then made upon the best informed, says, "Moreover, how could a mere man and no more," (the Jew in Celsus having been representing Jesus as such,) "how could a mere man and no more, effect the conversion of such multitudes, not of *thoughtful persons* merely, for there would have been no wonder in that (*καὶ οὐ θαυμαστὸν εἰ τῶν φρονίμων*), but even of the most unreasonable and the most enslaved to their passions, and through such want of sense, the most difficult to turn to a course of greater sobriety?"[4] "I have no wish,"

[1] Origen speaks of Celsus as such, *Ἀρά συ προσάγων ἀνθρώπους φιλοσοφίᾳ.*—Contra Celsum, III. § 74, et alibi. He was an Epicurean (I. § 8; III. § 75), though apparently unwilling to avow it, *ἀγωνιάσθω οὖν μηκέτι κρύπτων τὴν ἑαυτοῦ αἵρεσιν, ἀλλ' ὁμολογῶν Ἐπικούρειος εἶναι, κ.τ.λ.*—III. § 80; and again IV. § 4. And how imperfectly informed on the affairs of the Christians were even the most curious of these infidel philosophers, appears from many of the objections of Celsus, probably the least ignorant of them all; and which as they are generally given by Origen as quotations in Celsus' own words cannot be misrepresented; *εἰ δὲ διὰ τὰ μὴ ἀρέσκοντα Κελσῳ Χριστιανῶν καὶ Ἰουδαίων δόγματα, ἃ μηδὲ τὴν ἀρχὴν ἐπίστασθαι φαίνεται, κ.τ.λ.*—IV. § 26.

[2] I. § 27.

[3] VI. § 14.

[4] II. § 79.

says he again on another occasion, "that the ranks of the Christians should be made up of dolts, on the contrary, I seek for the lively and acute, as persons better able to attain to the meaning of mysteries (*αἰνιγμάτων*) and of such things as are spoken darkly in the law and the prophets and the Gospels, writings which you, Celsus, despise, as containing nothing worthy of a thought; because you do not fathom the sense, nor try to penetrate the intention of the writer:"[1] to be sure a system which applied to the feelings and wants of the poor above all others, and was so constructed as only to find favour with the humble of heart, would naturally in the first instance meet with acceptance from them rather than from others: but its own intrinsic excellence soon recommended it to all; and the writings of the Fathers most abundantly testify that in a very short time it made an effectual inroad amongst the most intelligent and opulent.

The great acquirements of many of the Fathers themselves, to which their works bear witness, would indeed be enough to show that there were many amongst the early Christians of sound education and liberal attainments: Gibbon, indeed, himself, allows that "the faith of Christ" "was embraced by several persons who derived some consequence from the advantages of nature and fortune;"[2] at the same time himself offering a catalogue of them, such as it is—but undoubtedly the fair way of regarding each of the Fathers is, that he was a type of numbers, who being of like circumstances with himself adopted a like course. Justin Martyr, for instance, had been under the hands of teachers of almost every school of philosophy that existed, and found, as he tells us, satisfaction in none; nor could he rest, till directed to the writings of the prophets he discovered in them at last a footing on which he could fix.[3] From the account that Tatian gives of his own conversion we see that he went through the same process. He too, after having examined the creeds of various sects of the heathens, and after meeting with evil in them all, at length fell in with the Scriptures, and felt that then at length he had arrived at truth which he was in search of.[4] What was there in the cases of these two persons to make them peculiar? They

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 74.
[2] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 372.
[3] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 2, *et seq.*
[4] Tatian, Oratio contra Græcos, §§ 28, 29, Paris Ed.

happen to be specific instances of learned men who turned Christians, but is it not reasonable to suppose that multitudes did the same, of whom no records remain; particularly as the course of incidents which led to the change in the instances we are contemplating, is the most natural and ordinary that can be imagined?

Again, the passages in the Fathers, which directly and without circumlocution assert that many among the Christians were of superior birth and breeding—one or two of which, indeed, Gibbon notices,[1] though in a manner to attach to them little weight—would not be so easily disposed of by a candid inquirer after truth as he thinks. Tertullian in one place speaks of it as an alleged popular grievance that "persons of every sex, age, condition, and *now*," he adds (as if that was a more recent feature of the case) "*rank*, are passing over to the Christians."[2] There is something characteristic of accuracy of statement in the introduction of the "jam"; the titled were not the very earliest converts; and if we adopt the other reading "etiam," the inference would not be very different. Again, in his appeal to Scapula, the president of Africa, in behalf of the Christians, Tertullian, whilst reminding this magistrate of others in authority, who had acted mercifully towards the Christians, speaks of Severus "having left unharmed certain most illustrious women, and most illustrious men, who belonged to this sect."[3] Gibbon refers to a passage in this short tract, where Tertullian asks how Carthage could bear the *decimation*, if Scapula should proceed to despatch the Christians, seeing that it contained so many thousands of them of all ranks[4]; and yet using it as he does for a purpose of his own, he takes no notice of the phrase I have just cited; nor yet by the by (for I will name it in passing, though it rather belongs to the subject of my last Lecture, the number of the early Christians), of another which occurs in that tract, and which would serve to qualify the conclusion he draws from the one he does quote. "Even Tertullian's rhetoric" (such this conclusion is) "rises no higher than to claim a *tenth* part of Carthage"[5]—the term *decimate* taken literally. But it should

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 375.

[2] Omnem sexum, ætatem, conditionem, et jam dignitatem transgredi ad hoc nomen.—Tertullian, Apol. c. i.

[3] Clarissimas fœminas et clarissimos viros.—Ad Scapulam, c. iv.

[4] c. v.

[5] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 374, note 189.

seem to be a term loosely used, and as equivalent to "put to death;" for only the page before, Tertullian had described the Christians as "pars pene major civitatis cujusque,"[1] "almost the majority of every state," that of Carthage, therefore, included, as it needs must be from the nature of the argument, which is to show Scapula how inoffensive they were, notwithstanding their numbers. Perhaps neither the one expression nor the other was meant to be construed rigorously; all I contend for is, that if Gibbon chose to draw an inference from the word *decimate*, that Tertullian in his flights did not dream of more than a tenth of the population of Carthage being Christian, he should not have suppressed his other assertion in the very same treatise, that they were almost a majority. But to return: again, in his treatise "De Fugâ in Persecutione,"[2] one of the questions which Tertullian entertains is, whether it is lawful to buy off persecution; for he had already determined that it was not lawful to flee from it: and this, also, for various reasons which he assigns, good and bad, he decides in the negative. But in arguing the question, it evidently never enters into his account that funds would be wanting for such a purpose, which would have been a thought at any rate likely to present itself to him when treating on such a subject, had any such difficulty occurred to his mind; in the absence, therefore, of it, we must conclude that there was no such difficulty, or in other words, that the Christians were not altogether of the mean condition ascribed to them. But on this point I shall have more to say after a while. In the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, describing to their friends in Asia the persecution that had befallen them, one of the victims, whose name is given, Vettius Epagathus, is expressly spoken of as a person of distinction.[3] And it appears incidentally in Origen's "Exhortatio ad Martyrium," that Ambrosius, one of the two persons to whom he addresses that treatise, as indeed he does other of his writings,[4] was a man of large possessions, it being one of Origen's arguments that those who are called to suffer of such a class have reason to rejoice at having greater sacrifices to make, and greater enjoyments to resign than others; and by consequence, according

[1] Ad Scapulam, c. ii.
[2] De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. xii.
[3] Καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἐπίσημος.—Reliq. Sacr. I. p. 270.
[4] Origen, Prefatio ad Libros contra Celsum, § 1.

to our Lord's promise,[1] at having higher rewards to receive.[2] Nay, in his treatise against Celsus, when defending the early Christian teachers against the charge of having been influenced in their views by the hope of gain, he says, "In these days, perhaps, when by reason of *the multitude of converts to the word, rich persons, and some in offices of dignity and distinction, and delicate and noble women*, receive the Christian teachers; one or other may dare to affirm that some undertake the task of teaching Christianity for the credit of the thing (*διὰ τὸ δοξάριον*), but no such suspicion can attach to the first teachers, when the risk they ran was great: and even now the ill name they get amongst the rest of mankind is more than an equivalent to the credit they acquire with those of the same way of thinking as themselves; nor indeed do they get this credit universally."[3]

But the fact itself may be established upon much broader grounds. Let us look at much of our early ecclesiastical literature, and gather from that the condition of the parties to whom it addresses itself. It will be evident to every candid reader of it that they could have been no mere peasants or artisans, but must have been, to a very large extent, persons of refinement and easy circumstances. The writings of Clemens Alexandrinus bear most ample testimony to this fact—the Pædagogue especially. It would be impossible for any one to peruse this treatise, which professes to instruct the converts to Christianity in the application of their new faith to the details of every-day life, without being convinced that its author had in his eye principally, almost exclusively, converts of the upper classes of society. Why else should he lay down the rules he does for the regulation of the table? If he was writing for the poor, why caution them against the use of recondite dishes drawn from the most remote corners of the world? "Lampreys from Sicily; eels from the Mæander; kids from Melos; mullets from Sciathus; shell-fish from Pelorum; oysters from Abydos; anchovies from Lipara; turnips from Mantinea; beets from Ascra"; "soles from Attica; thrushes from Daphne; Chelidonian figs"; "fowls from Phasis (pheasants); quails from Egypt; peacocks from Media"[4]? or against indulgence in exquisite wines?—"Be not over curious about the Chian, nor

[1] Matt. xix. 27.
[2] Exhortatio ad Martyrium, § 14.
[3] Contra Celsum, III. § 9.
[4] Clem. Alex. Pædag. II. c. i. p. 164.

yet about the Ariusian: thirst only claims a supply to meet it, not delicate liqueurs. Foreign wines are for an appetite palled through satiety. The Thasian, the fragrant Lesbian, the sweet Cretan, the luscious Syracusan, that of Mendes in Egypt, and that of the insular Naxos, and the odoriferous wine of Italy, all these are many kinds, but to a temperate liver all wines are one, the produce of one God. For why should not the wine of the country serve to satisfy the taste?"[1] His restrictions on furniture still lead to the same inference. "Away," says he, "with Thericlean and Antigonian cups, with tankards and saucers and shells, and vessels of ten thousand other sorts; coolers and flagons; silver and gold, both in private and public, are an invidious possession—a possession hard to acquire, not easy to retain, and inconvenient to use. Furthermore, vain and curious manufactures of glass, the more easily broken by reason of the delicacy of the fabric, teaching you to fear for them whilst you drink out of them, must be banished from our system—and couches of silver, and ewers, and cruets, and plates and dishes, and other utensils of silver and gold . . . . tripods of ivory, and sofas inlaid with the same, and with silver feet; chamber doors studded with gold, and variegated with tortoiseshell; counterpanes of purple, and other rare colours, emblems of unseemly luxury, superfluities conducing to envy and sloth, ought all to be put away as not worthy our notice; for 'the time,' saith the Apostle, 'is short.' . . . . . Will not a table-knife cut without golden rivets and an ivory handle? Cannot a joint be carved without steel from India? What if the ewer be of earthenware, will it not hold the water for washing the hands? and the foot-bath that for the feet[2]? . . . . . Furniture of all kinds should be in harmony with the character of the Christian, and be duly adapted to the person, the age, the pursuits, the season[3] . . . ill-regulated wealth is an arsenal of mischief . . . . . all property is given us to be used rightly . . . . . the best riches is to have few wants; the truest magnanimity not to take pride in wealth, but to despise it."[4] Surely it would be wasting words to talk thus to labourers and mechanics. Tertullian's treatise "De Cultu Fœminarum," on female dress, reads us the

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. II. c. ii. pp. 184, 185.
[2] c. iii. p. 189.
[3] p. 190.
[4] p. 191.

same lesson. It could not have entered that author's head to compose such a treatise on such a subject, if Christian women had consisted exclusively, or anything like it, of the poorer orders. The occasion of the essay was this. The Christian females, jealous of the superior ornaments of the heathen, were indulging a taste for personal decoration beyond what Tertullian thought was seemly, and accordingly they provoke him to address to them a word of advice. He disparages silver, gold, and jewels, to the utmost. "Silver and gold are less noble than earth; for they are earth wrought by the hands of wretches in the mines; earth transmuted from purposes of torment to purposes of ornament; from affliction to affectation; from ignominy to honour."[1] "The pearl is but the pustule of a bad oyster. Gems are extracted from the forehead of the snake . . . . This forsooth was lacking to the Christian woman, to owe her toilet to the serpent! Thus was she to bruise its head by drawing forth a decoration for her own!"[2] "Ten thousand sesterces shall be strung on a single thread. A delicate neck shall carry about it woods and islands.[3] The slender skin of the ear shall bear a whole ledger; and every left-hand finger play with bags of coin."[4] It is needless to make further extracts from this characteristic appeal. Cyprian follows the same subject up in his "De Habitu Virginum;" the whole of which offers the clearest testimony to the superior rank and condition of the Christians. "But some *women are rich and affluent*, who are not for concealing the fact, but contend that they ought to make use of their wealth. Let such be assured that that woman is truly rich who is rich in God and in Christ—that those are the true riches which are heavenly, and which are laid up for us with God as a perpetual possession. . . . . *You say you are rich.* Paul meets your case, and prescribes moderation in your ornaments. Let your 'women adorn themselves in modest apparel,' says he, 'with shame-facedness and sobriety, not with broidered

[1] Tertullian, De Cultu Fœminarum, I. c. v.

[2] c. vi.

[3] It is curious to find a coincidence between this passage and the paper in the Spectator where Sir Roger de Coverley tells of the ornaments and presents he meant to lavish on the widow, had she consented to be his wife. "He had disposed of an hundred acres in a diamond ring . . . upon her wedding-day she should have carried on her head fifty of the tallest oaks upon his estate . . . he would have given her a coal-pit to keep her in clean linen . . . he would have allowed her the profits of a windmill for her fans."—No. 295.

[4] De Cultu Fœminarum, I. c. ix.

hair or gold.'[1] Peter writes after the same fashion[2] . . . . . and if they lay such restraints even upon married women, who have the excuse of having husbands to please, what defence can be set up for virgins? . . . *You say you are rich.* But all things are not expedient that are lawful. . . . . If you adorn your persons so as to attract and inflame young men, you cannot be said to be of a chaste mind yourselves. Neither can you be reckoned among the virgins of Christ, whilst you live to be admired. . . . . *You say that you are rich,* and ought to make use of the goods which God has given you. Do so in the manner God wishes. Let the poor know that you are rich. Lend to God your estate. Secure to yourselves the prayers of many. Lay up treasure in heaven. You offend against God, if you abuse his gifts, instead of using them for the purposes he intends. The voice is God's gift; but it is not to be used in lewd songs. Iron is God's gift; but it is not to be turned to murder. . . . . Let chaste virgins flee such decorations as are only the emblems of a brothel. . . . . Those who put on silk and purple, cannot put on Christ. Those who are adorned with gold and pearls and necklaces, have lost the ornaments of the heart."[3] Is it fair to affect to reply to the objection, that the early Christians were of mean station, by producing three or four solitary instances to the contrary, and leave unnoticed whole treatises like these? quite a section of Christian literature? which, by their very nature and subject, prove to demonstration, though in a manner the most incidental and satisfactory, that there must have been multitudes of a higher grade? Indeed, as far as Mr. Gibbon is concerned, there are passages in his autobiography where he touches upon the course of his studies, which would lead us to suspect that his acquaintance with the Fathers, though he does speak of them as entering into the plan of his reading, was limited; that this was a mine of materials for his history, which he did not labour with the same care as some others; and that of their writings, the Apologies, or such treatises as without bearing the name are of the nature of Apologies, were those he had chiefly consulted; naturally expecting to find in that division of their works the chief information of which

[1] 1 Tim. ii. 9.
[2] 1 Pet. iii. 3, 4.
[3] Cyprian, De Habitu Virginum, §§ vii. viii. ix. xi. xii. xiii.

he was in search[1]: but I have often observed in the course of my Lectures, how much of the knowledge you derive from the Fathers, comes upon you by surprise; and, as in the present instance, how frequently you are able to draw most important conclusions from treatises, the titles of which promise no such results: and accordingly I believe that Mr. Gibbon, in reckoning upon the Apologies as containing most or all the facts which would be of value to him, if he did so reckon, was deceived; and did not fully apprehend the miscellaneous character of the writings of the Fathers in general. But this by the way.

Then the very style of many of the early Christian writings is indicative of the position of those to whom it speaks, and for whom it is adopted. We naturally judge of the condition of a party to whom a letter is addressed, in the opinion at least of his correspondent, by the language in which he communicates with him, and the subjects he chooses for his communication. And judging of the early Christians by this test, they will not appear to have been, as a body, mean and ignorant, but far otherwise. Take, for instance, the treatise of Athenagoras on the Resurrection. We may gather from a passage near the close of it, that it was delivered before a congregation; was perhaps a kind of sermon. He had endeavoured, he there says, to point out in a summary way to those who were assembled (*τοῖς συνελθοῦσιν*), what they ought to think of a resurrection; and to suit his argument to the capacity of his hearers (*τῇ δυνάμει τῶν παρόντων*[2]). That these hearers were a mixed audience is certainly probable; that there were unbelievers present as well as Christians: indeed, in the beginning of the address, he speaks of some persons being altogether incredulous on the subject of the resurrection; others doubtful; and even of those who received certain hypotheses (*i. e.* of the Christian faith), some being in difficulty about this one; their hesitation the result of feeling more than of reason.[3] But it was not a *heathen* audience. He quotes in one place a verse from the first Epistle to the Corinthians[4]; founds his argument in

[1] See Gibbon's Life, pp. 135. 224. 287, Milman's Ed.
[2] Athenagoras, De Mort. Resur. § 23, Paris Ed.
[3] § 1.
[4] § 19.

part upon a future judgment, when the sins of which both body and soul have partaken having to be accounted for, it is only just that both body and soul should be present to receive sentence[1]; and those sins he refers to the breach of God's commandments as revealed in Scripture, which he quotes.[2] I say, therefore, that all this bespeaks the audience not to have been heathen, or not to have been exclusively heathen. It was made up at all events of a class which either actually were Christians, or were likely to become such. But who can read this essay without being satisfied that it could not have consisted of unlettered boors? It is evidently delivered to a very intelligent audience. I cannot afford to give you even a summary of the treatise, for it is a summary itself, and therefore must be produced at length, if it is to have its just effect; but there are not many objections which can be urged against the resurrection of the body which it does not encounter and remove; nor many arguments which can be advanced in its favour (for it takes both lines) which it does not press; many of them too refined ones, and such as would be lost upon an unlettered assembly. Or take the case of the Stromata of Clemens, its very principle is a transcendental one. It leads to the truths of revelation through *philosophy*.[3] It purposes to contain truth under a disguise[4]; under a disguise which none will be able to penetrate but the thoughtful and reflecting.[5] How could Clemens contemplate any other readers than sagacious ones for a work constructed upon a plan like this? Again, "We have no desire," writes Origen, who is actuated by the same views as Clemens, "we have no desire to divert the young from the study of philosophy, but such as have been already trained in the cycle of the sciences, we endeavour to elevate to that majestic and sublime eloquence, hidden though it be from the vulgar, which discusses questions the greatest and most important of all, and shows that their philosophy is founded on the prophets of God, and the Apostles of Jesus."[6] And turn to the treatise of this same Father περὶ Εὐχῆς, in which he gives a copious commentary on the Lord's Prayer, and consider whether it would be level to the capacity of the uninformed and ignorant;

[1] Athenagoras, De Mort. Resur. §§ 20, 21.
[2] § 23.
[3] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § i. p. 326.
[4] § xii. p. 348.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 58.

whether his metaphysical disquisition, for instance, characteristic enough of its author, on the term *οὐσία* or essence, when he is employed in explaining the term *ἐπιούσιος*, which occurs in that prayer; or his discussion on the right posture of prayer, where he comments on the text, "Every knee shall bow of things in heaven," &c., and gives it a spiritual meaning; taking that opportunity to be sure of announcing that all who had treated of heavenly bodies with most accuracy, had demonstrated that they were spherical, and consequently concluding that they cannot be understood to have knees in a literal sense[1]—whether speculations like these could possibly be meant for artisans? I do not think it worth while to illustrate this proposition by further examples of the writings of the Fathers, though nothing would be more easy than to multiply them to any extent.

I will add another consideration quite distinct from any of the previous ones, which still leads us to the same result. If the body of Christians in very early times was composed so exclusively of the meanest of the people as some pretend, whence were the funds derived which ministered to its support and extension, for that they must have been very considerable indeed, is clear?

In the first place, the clergy had to be maintained. They were in general supported by a monthly fixed payment,[2] as we learn from Cyprian, who directs it in the instance of certain clergy under accusation to be suspended. The same Bishop seems to be speaking of his own share in the Church revenues, when he uses on one occasion the term "sua propria quantitas;" desiring it, when he was in concealment, to be distributed amongst the widows, sick, and poor; and perhaps distinguishing it from an additional sum which he remits for the same purpose, but which he calls "portio;"[3] as on another occasion he speaks of "quantitas propria nostra," as distinguished from the "summulæ" of his colleagues and brother-priests[4]; and on a third he talks of having sent alms "de sumptibus propriis,"[5] and of a Deacon who was with him having done the same.[6] The amount of the provision for the clergy, though it would be a matter of great curiosity to

[1] Origen, De Oratione, § 31, vol. i. p. 268, Benedict. Ed.

[2] Divisio mensurna.—Cyprian, Ep. xxviii.

[3] Ep. xxxvi.

[4] Ep. lx.

[5] Ep. vi.

[6] Ibid.

ascertain it, I do not think we have the means of determining from testimony afforded by any of the Ante-Nicene Fathers. Indeed it is singular, when you come to investigate the minute details of social life in ancient times, how difficult it is to arrive at any certain conclusions: so much less does the most learned antiquary now know than the veriest peasant, who was an actor in the scene. The single fact which has been referred to, in elucidation of the question now before us, is one incidentally mentioned by Eusebius, who tells us that certain heretics at Rome, in the reign of Severus, about the end of the second century, or beginning of the third, persuaded one Natalius to be their Bishop, with a salary of 150 denarii a month,[1] or some 60*l.* a year. It has been argued that this may give us some idea of the salary of a Bishop of the Church in those days. The humanitarian heretics, however, to which class these belonged, we must remember, were a very insignificant number of persons—τινὲς as opposed to πλεῖστοι the orthodox[2]—and probably, therefore, had very limited means at their command. And even apart from this, we must bear in mind, in estimating the force of the Christian exchequer, which is the object for which I am bringing forward the case of Natalius, that even £60 was the representative then of very much more value than it would be now.[3]

Moreover, the number of these Bishops was very great; every town of any size possessing one—as again, the Presbyters and Deacons who were subject to him, apparently bore a much larger proportion to their congregations than they would do at present. Every one of the epistles of Ignatius addressed to an Asiatic Church, seems to contemplate a plurality of Presbyters and Deacons[4]; and so does the epistle of Clemens addressed to the Church of Corinth[5]; so that the payments, though individually they may have been small, must have been collectively very great. Add to this, that certainly in Cyprian's time, and probably down from the time of the Apostles (for we find the distinction between the clergy and the laity obtaining even so early as the epistle

[1] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 28.

[2] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 48.

[3] See Greswell on the Parables, vol. iv. p. 334, note.

[4] Ignatius, Ad Trall. § iii. Ad Ephes. §§ ii. iii. iv.; Ad Magnes. § vi.; Ad Philadelph. § iv.; Ad Smyrn. § viii.; Ad Polycarp. § vi.

[5] Clem. Rom. Ad Corinth. I. §§ xl. xliv. lvii.

of Clemens,[1] nay, probably in the use of the word ἰδιώτης by St. Paul himself,[2]) the clergy properly so called were exclusively devoted to the work of the ministry, and were not concerned in secular business, so that the whole of their maintenance must have devolved upon the fund. Indeed, so rigorous was the rule of the Church upon this point, that the clergy of the Church of Carthage at least were not allowed to be executors of wills; and Cyprian complains loudly of a particular instance in which this injunction had been violated[3]; expressly affirming that the minister of God ought to be wholly occupied in serving at the altar, and alleging that it was in order that the clergy might so devote themselves that they had their wants supplied by the brethren; such supply being an equivalent for tithes of old, as the position of the clergy was similar to that of the Levites. But the view here propounded, that the ecclesiastical fund, out of which the clergy were paid, was a substitute for the tithes under the law, would seem to lead to the inference that there was some resemblance in the amount.

I think, too, there were some peculiar circumstances in the position of the clergy in those primitive times, which would serve to increase their expenditure. So many difficulties and unforeseen contingencies were then arising in the Church from the novelty of its action, that a good deal of conference and intercourse between distant branches of it, was necessary in order to meet them, and establish uniformity in its proceedings, or even to provide for its wants. This had to be effected very generally by personal interviews; and accordingly long and expensive journeys had perpetually to be taken by parties intrusted with the management of ecclesiastical affairs. Thus it is probable that Clemens had been appealed to by deputation from the Church of Corinth to advise respecting the schisms in that Church.[4] It is certain that when after an interval he returned it his answer, it was done not merely by letter, but also by three messengers who bore that letter, and whom he desires the Corinthians to send back with all the speed they could, in order that he might the sooner learn

[1] Τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν ἴδιος ὁ τόπος προστέτακται, καὶ λευίταις ἴδιαι διακονίαι ἐπίκεινται· ὁ λαϊκὸς ἄνθρωπος τοῖς λαϊκοῖς προστάγμασιν δέδεται.—§ xl.

[2] 1 Cor. xiv. 16. [3] Cyprian, Ep. lxvi.

[4] Clem. Rom. Ad Corinth. I. § 1.

from them the condition of the Corinthian Church.[1] From a fragment of a work written by Serapion, a Bishop of Antioch of the second century (the same to whom I have before had occasion to refer), and preserved by Eusebius[2] on the Gospel of Peter, we find that Serapion had visited in person the Church of Rhossus in Cilicia, and that having then dropped a hasty opinion respecting this Gospel, which he afterwards discovered needed correction, and which had been acted upon by some heretically-disposed persons in the Church to the damage of religion, he meant to visit the Church again to redress the mistake. I am mentioning these incidents as showing the locomotion to which the duties of these primitive Bishops gave occasion. From another imperfect document by the same author, we conjecture that Sotas, a Bishop of Thrace, had travelled to Phrygia to satisfy himself with respect to the pretensions of the Montanists on the spot where their chief strength lay.[3] Again, a manuscript had been circulated by a heretic as containing a disputation which he had held with Origen, greatly misrepresenting his sentiments; and accordingly Origen tells us that the brethren in Palestine despatched a messenger to Athens, where he was staying, to procure from him a correct copy of the dialogue.[4] Irenæus was charged with a mission to Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, from the suffering Church of Lyons, probably in reference to this same heresy of Montanus, which at that time was convulsing Christendom.[5] Ignatius entreats Polycarp to call together a Council at Smyrna on the subject of the Church of Antioch: and this Council was to be assembled by messengers despatched by Polycarp to the neighbouring Churches; who in their turn were to depute representatives in person (πεζοὺς) to Antioch, when they were able; or otherwise to send letters[6]—perhaps the distinction made with reference to economy. These congresses of clergy not amounting to General Councils appear to have been of frequent occurrence. The light in which Irenæus represents the interview of St. Paul with the elders of the Church at Miletus is no doubt characteristic of such assemblies in his own day. "And from

[1] Clem. Rom. Ad Corinth. I. § lix.
[2] Eccles. Hist. vi. 12.
[3] v. 19.
[4] Origenis Epist. ad quosdam amicos Alexandrinos, vol. i. p. 6, Benedict. Ed.
[5] Euseb. Eccles. Hist. v. c. 4.
[6] Ignatius, Ep. ad Polycarp. § viii.

Miletus he sent to Ephesus, and called the elders of the Church,"[1] is the account of it in the Acts: but Irenæus construes this to mean that the "Bishops and Presbyters who were of Ephesus and all the neighbouring cities were called together at Miletus."[2] We have an intimation of a synod of clergy at Cæsarea in the second century, met to take measures with respect to the Easter controversy; and a fragment of the circular letter they concocted.[3] We have a portion of another similar epistle of about the same date, on the same subject, addressed to Victor, Bishop of Rome, by a synod of Bishops assembled at Ephesus, they having been called together by Polycrates, a Bishop of that place.[4] Tertullian, in a passage I have already cited, speaks of Councils of all the Churches held at stated places throughout Greece, which represented the whole Christian community in those parts, and where great questions were settled[5]; and in another of his treatises[6] he intimates that the Canon of Scripture was one, and no doubt a most important subject of discussion at those Councils. I could bring numberless passages from Cyprian (from whose writings we derive a fuller insight into the organization of the Church than from those of any other of the Ante-Nicene Fathers), to show the personal intercourse which subsisted both between scattered members of the same Church, and between distant Churches; the care with which the accredited parties were convened to confer on critical ecclesiastical questions, such *e. g.* as the readmission of the lapsed to communion[7]; or the zeal with which messengers were sent even to very remote quarters for intelligence, to witness, for instance, the consecration of a Bishop,[8] that there might be no loophole left to schismatics for denying its validity[9]; but I shall forbear, feeling that I have already said enough to establish my point, which was to show, that the locomotion which was called for in the early Church was such as to entail on it a peculiar expenditure; for whether all these journeys were to be borne by the private finances of the parties, or by the Church's exchequer, the conclusion is equally valid,

[1] Acts xx. 17.
[2] Irenæus, III. c. xiv. § 2.
[3] Reliq. Sacr. vol. i. p. 359. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. v. c. 25.
[4] Reliq. Sacr. vol. i. p. 372. Euseb. Eccles. Hist. v. c. 24.
[5] De Jejuniis, c. xiii.
[6] De Pudicitiâ, c. x.
[7] Cyprian, Ep. xi.
[8] Ep. xli.
[9] Ep. xlii.

that there must have been many opulent persons in the Church to furnish the means.

But it was not a numerous clergy only that had to be maintained, or peculiar duties which then devolved upon them to discharge, which drew upon this fund. It was applied to many other purposes—to the relief of the orphans, the widows, the sick, the indigent, the prisoners, the strangers, who happened to be sojourning within its reach; and in short, as Justin Martyr tells us, to all who were in want,[1]—Tertullian adds, to burying as well as feeding the poor; and enumerates among the objects to whom it extended its aid, aged servants, shipwrecked persons, those condemned to the mines or to exile for the sake of religion.[2] And if the details of this expenditure were followed up, they would still serve to aggravate our notions of its amount. Thus we learn from one of the Constitutions,[3] that it entered into the Church's notion of the care of an orphan, that he should be taught a trade, and be enabled to buy tools and discharge himself from being longer burdensome to the Church: and from a passage in Cyprian, that the Church comprehended within its idea of 'indigent,' persons whom it was desirable to release from an unlawful calling, and for whom it was necessary to make a provision under prudent restrictions, to which I may hereafter have occasion to advert, as players for example[4]; and from another passage in the same author, we have a glimpse afforded us of the drain upon the purse of the Church, which the redemption of Christians from captivity amongst barbarian nations proved; for we find on one single occasion of this kind there recorded, no less a sum than 800*l.* (sestertia centum millia nummorum)[5] sent by the Church of Carthage to the Bishops of Numidia to be applied to this charitable purpose.[6] And besides all these demands upon the Church's chest, there was another which must have eventually become a very heavy tax on individuals; for as the act it involved was not sanctioned by the Church, it would not of course provide for it out of its exchequer; that of buying off the victims of persecution from the fate that awaited them—a provision, which probably in

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 67.
[2] Tertullian, Apol. c. xxxix.
[3] Constitutionum Apost. IV. c. ii.
[4] Cyprian, Ep. lxi.
[5] See Evans' Biography of the Early Church, vol. ii. p. 196.
[6] Cyprian, Ep. lx. § 3.

part defeated its own end, the prospect of a bribe often no doubt stimulating the persecution. Symptoms of this abuse had shown themselves even during the lives of the Apostles; Felix "hoped that money should have been given him of Paul, that he might loose him; wherefore he sent for him the oftener."[1] Tertullian, indeed, in a treatise, to which I have already had occasion to refer, gives the Roman government credit for never having extorted, officially at least, a fund from the Christians by allowing them to redeem their lives at a fixed sum, various as its modes were of raising a revenue, and profitable as such an impost might be made owing to the vast numbers of Christians[2]; and he ascribes it to the over-ruling Providence of God, in whose hand is the heart of the Prince, that it had so come to pass. But the time afterwards arrived, as we learn from Cyprian, when, whether overtly or clandestinely, large sums were received by the Roman magistrates on this account, the Libellatici, or persons who had purchased certificates of exemption from suffering, proving to be a considerable class in the Church, Bishops even amongst the number; and the proper manner of dealing with them becoming one of the most serious difficulties of the early Church[3]—a difficulty, which evidently perplexes Cyprian, who, though in one of his earlier letters treating it with a certain degree of indulgence or at least forbearance,[4] is induced at length (the abuse probably becoming flagrant, and the persons, who took advantage of it, numerous), to denounce the practice with great warmth, accounting it equivalent to apostacy.[5] My object in referring to it is distinct from any consideration of its lawfulness or the contrary; and is simply to prove, that the early Christians had pecuniary resources to a greater amount than is sometimes supposed.

[1] Acts xxiv. 26.
[2] Tertullian, De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. xii.
[3] Ep. lxviii.; De Lapsis, § xxvii.
[4] Ep. lii. §§ 17. 22.
[5] De Lapsis, § xxvii.

LECTURE III.

The insinuation of Gibbon, that the Church was recruited, 1°. By abandoned characters, suggested by Celsus, inconsistent with the primitive discipline, the probation before Baptism, the responsibility attaching to the sponsors, the appeal of the Apologists to the pure morality of the Christians, their charges of laxity against the heretics and the philosophers, the treatment of the lapsed, the frequency of excommunication: 2°. By mercenary persons, repudiated by Origen, inconsistent with the precautions used against mercenary motives and the maladministration of the Church fund, and with a passage in the Constitutions: 3°. By foundlings, incapable of being substantiated by any positive evidence. Probability that it might happen occasionally. Negative proof that it did not happen systematically. How the Church fund was really expended.

I CONTINUE my investigation of the character of the early Christians, as discoverable in the writings of the early Fathers—a topic bearing upon the *Evidences* in various ways, and at the same time tributary to the history of the Primitive Church. I have shown that their numbers were much more considerable, and their condition much less exclusively mean and low, than the enemies of Christianity have represented them to be. But there are some other arguments to their disparagement which I have not yet noticed, that touch upon these two features of the Primitive Church, though in a manner still further to misrepresent it. It is said, that you may account for such numbers of Christians as there were, 1st, by the free invitations that were given to the most abandoned characters to join their ranks; and 2nd, by the bribes that were held out to all. I will take these two objections in their order; and I am the more disposed to examine them, as in so doing, I shall incidentally have to lay before you much of the discipline of the early Church.

You will remember, no doubt, a remarkable passage in the History of the Decline and Fall, in which the first of these insinuations is thus insidiously conveyed. "It is a very ancient reproach, suggested by the ignorance or the malice of infidelity, that the Christians allured into their party the

most atrocious criminals, who, as soon as they were touched by a sense of remorse, were easily persuaded to wash away, in the water of Baptism, the guilt of their past conduct, for which the temples of the gods refused to grant them any expiation. But this reproach, when it is cleared from misrepresentation, contributes as much to the honour, as it did to the increase of the Church."[1] This accusation, that the Christians in the first instance swelled their ranks by very readily admitting into them the outcasts of society, who on a slight persuasion were prepared to express a touch of remorse, and be baptized, appears to have been suggested to this author by a hint from Celsus, which transpires in Origen's treatise against that unbeliever,[2] and to have been improved by Gibbon. There is, indeed, a history told of St. John, by Clemens in his "Quis dives salvetur,"[3] which tradition, he says, had preserved; that St. John, after his return from Patmos visited the Churches in the neighbourhood of Ephesus—that on that occasion he consigned to the care of the Bishop of one of those Churches (Smyrna, it is supposed) a youth, whom he had met with, of some promise—that the Bishop undertook the charge—received him into his house—nurtured, trained, and finally baptized him—that after this, the Bishop having lost sight of him, the youth got into bad company, and became eventually a captain of banditti—that after a season St. John returned to those parts—inquired after the young man—heard his history—reproached the Bishop with neglect—and went in pursuit of him—that the youth on recognising him at first fled from him, but persuaded to stay and implored to turn again to Christ, he at length consented with bitter tears, baptized by them, as it were, a second time—that accordingly the Apostle, after praying, and after frequent fastings with the penitent, restored him to the Church before he went away; and left him a signal example of genuine repentance. But this case does not support Gibbon's reproach, if, indeed, it occurred to him; for the party was not received into the Church at first till after due examination and instruction, and was at that time of irreproachable character; nor is he reported to have been reconciled with the Church, even by an Apostle, till after deep and protracted humiliation.

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 316.
[2] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 59.
[3] Clem. Alex. Quis dives salvetur, § xlii. pp. 959, 960.

The truth is, the whole stream of primitive testimony runs counter to this hypothesis of the sceptic. If the Church was so anxious to multiply her members at any rate; and provided she had recruits cared not to what class they belonged, how came she to insist on so much probation, as she did, before she admitted them? The barriers she set up were many; and were evidently constructed for the express purpose of keeping improper persons out. Candidates for Baptism were most carefully prepared. There seems to have been an interval even before they were allowed to become catechumens: an interval, during which they were called "auditores," hearers,[1] or "novitioli," novices[2]; and a Lector or Reader was appointed to teach them.[3] After this, they were pronounced catechumens; but before admission even into this humble class they had to make a profession similar to that now made at Baptism,[4] a profession in which they declared a belief in the words of the Christian law, and in which they renounced the devil and his pomp and his angels (the very phraseology, you see, still in use[5]). Then, whilst they were in the condition of catechumens, *oral* and other elementary instruction was regularly imparted to them, as the very name implies; and allusions to the practice abound in the Fathers; indeed, this quiet, but laborious process it was, that no doubt under God laid the foundations of the Church; and is one which can never safely be dispensed with in any age of it—*γάλα μὲν ἡ κατήχησις, οἱονεὶ πρωτὴ ψυχῆς τροφὴ νοηθήσεται*,[6] "milk must be understood to be catechizing, the soul's first food, as it were," is the language of Clemens Alexandrinus. The period during which the catechumen continued in that state, was in the time of the Constitutions three years[7]; and it is not improbable that the interval during which the catechumen was undergoing preparation for Baptism is implied in the expression in the Epistle to the Hebrews,[8] *μὴ πάλιν θεμέλιον καταβαλλόμενοι . . . βαπτισμῶν διδαχῆς*—not as our translation has it, "laying again the foundation . . . of the doctrine of Baptisms," but of the "teaching of Baptisms;" the previous instruction, which might well be called "the

[1] Tertullian, De Pœnitentiâ, c. vi.
[2] Ibid. [3] Cyprian, Ep. xxiv.
[4] Tertullian, De Coronâ, c. iii.
[5] De Spectaculis, c. iv.
[6] Clem. Alex. Stromat. V. § x. p. 685.
[7] *Τρία ἔτη κατηχείσθω.*—Constit. VIII. c. xxxii.
[8] Heb. vi. 1, 2.

principles of the doctrine of Christ,"[1] or "the foundation."[2] Then after being thus maturely prepared for Baptism, he was called upon to make the same profession of faith and duty as before, a second time, previous to the administration of the Sacrament itself.[3] What could be more remote from a precipitate canvassing for recruits of any description, however abandoned, than all this? Neither were these all the precautions observed. Sponsors were required, who should look to the parties fulfilling their promises; and should vouch for their character and circumstances. Tertullian evidently considers the office as one of great charge: so much so, that on one occasion, he urges some delay in the administration of the rite of Baptism to children, on the ground that sponsors ought not to be loaded with needless responsibility; seeing that having so long time to continue in the office (supposing the party baptized to be an infant), they might die before they could fulfil the duties they had undertaken; or might be deceived in the disposition of the child.[4] And the Apostolical Constitutions regard these sponsors as provided in a great measure to afford guarantees for the character of the catechumen.[5] "Let those who first come to the holy mystery be led by the Deacons to the Bishop or to the Presbyters; and let them examine into the reasons wherefore they are come to the Word of the Lord. And let *those who bring them bear witness unto them, knowing accurately what concerns them.* And let their manners and life be examined into, and whether they be slaves or freemen." Whence could all this precaution have originated, but from a very anxious wish on the part of the authorities of the Church to keep it pure, rather than to keep it full? And how well these prudential measures answered is testified by the fact of which the Apologists repeatedly boast, and challenge their adversaries to dispute it, that Christians were never found in the calendar of criminals.[6] But is it credible that such a character could have been maintained by them as a body, had they consisted in any consider-

[1] Heb. vi. 1.

[2] Ibid. See Bp. Pearson's Minor Theological Works, vol. ii. p. 45. Concio. IV.

[3] Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. xiii. and De Coronâ, c. iii.

[4] Quid enim necesse est, sponsores etiam periculo ingeri? quia et ipsi per mortalitatem destituere promissiones suas possunt, et proventu malæ indolis falli.—De Baptismo, c. xviii.

[5] Constitut. VIII. c. xxxii.

[6] Tertullian, Apol. c. xliv.; Minucius Felix, Octav. c. xxxv.

able proportion of such converts as is here alleged? Would there not of necessity have been many backsliders in such a community? And, indeed, Origen flatly denies the fact, affirming expressly, that it was not true that the majority of Christian converts consisted of reformed rakes; but on the contrary, that those whose consciences were clearest were best disposed to accept a Gospel, which held out such rewards for the good.[1] Besides, so far from exhibiting a desire to catch recruits by any unworthy concessions, the early Christians betray the very contrary tendency. Irenæus makes it a matter of charge against the Valentinians, that they grafted their religion on heathenism, in order to win proselytes.[2] Would he have ventured on this reproach, had the Church itself beat up for converts, by offering Baptism upon easy terms to every outcast? Tertullian is singularly animated against the heretics for the latitudinarian and popular arts they exercised in order to swell their congregations. "Nowhere is promotion more easy than in the camp of the rebels; for to be found there is enough to secure advancement;"[3] with much more to the same effect. He would scarcely have spoken thus, had he felt that the heretics could recriminate. Indeed, Origen himself, in animadverting upon this and similar charges advanced by Celsus, appeals, as I have been doing, to the cautious discrimination used by the Christians in their admission of candidates to their assemblies, the classes into which they divided them, and the exceptions they made to them: their practice in this respect, says he, contrasting remarkably with that of the Grecian philosophers, who were only too ready to welcome to their benches all who would present themselves.[4]

Again, the rigour with which the early Church treated the lapse of those she had succeeded in securing to herself as members; the severity with which she excluded them from her body after delinquency, argues that she was not intent upon improving her nominal muster-rolls, but upon having all who belonged to her faithful and true. How easily does she allow the communion with her, which Baptism established, to be forfeited; and the relation accordingly to cease—public

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 65.
[2] Irenæus, II. c. xiv. § 8.
[3] Tertull., De Præscript. Hæret. c. xli.
[4] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 51.

absolution of the Church to be conceded but once,[1] if, indeed once, after deadly and wilful sin[2]—no encouragement offered to accept it, till after severe mortification undergone. Cyprian is most resolute upon this point: keenly reproves certain Presbyters, who, from a desire to be popular, had received again the Lapsed, prematurely as he thought.[3] They were unmindful, says he, of the Gospel, who so acted.[4] He reproaches the heretics with this facility of restoring to their favour parties who had disgraced themselves.[5] He would have obstacles thrown in the way of their reception as penitents. They must wait till the Bishop, Clergy and people had been convened.[6] He would relax so far as that they should not be suffered to *die* without the Pax of the Church being conceded to them.[7] And in one place he speaks incidentally of this probation having lasted three years[8]; as Origen does of its extending to a longer period than that assigned to the first process of conversion to Christianity.[9] Even then, and when all this preliminary ordeal had been gone through, the confession exacted was a public and most humiliating act[10]; the penitent placed in the vestibule of the Church, previous to readmission, a spectacle to others[11]; clothed in sackcloth[12]; at length introduced within the walls; prostrated before the congregation; and the Priest charged to deliver over him an admonitory lecture for the edification of all present; a moral dissection of a living subject[13]; and after all, the party never again to be admitted to any office or dignity in the Church.[14] All this was a discipline calculated to deter many from seeking restoration; and, as we know in fact, did deter many: and the whole, I repeat, is utterly inconsistent with a disposition to receive into the Church with open arms persons of previous vicious lives, simply with a view to numerical display.

Then the many offences against which excommunication was levelled by the laws and regulations of the Church tend to

[1] Tertullian, De Pœnitentiâ, c. ix. and c. vii.; Hermas, II. Mandat. iv.; Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xiii. pp. 459, 460.
[2] Tertullian, De Pudicitiâ, c. xviii.
[3] Cyprian, Ep. ix.
[4] Ep. xi. § 2. [5] Ep. lv. § 12.
[6] Ep. xiii. [7] Ep. xiv. § 3. *et alibi.*
[8] Ep. liii. § 1.
[9] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 51.
[10] Tertullian, De Pœnitentiâ, c. xi.
[11] c. vii. [12] c. xi.
[13] De Pudicitiâ, c. xiii. and c. iii.
[14] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 51.

prove the same point, and to show that the Church never thought of governing herself by calculations of how this or that would tell upon her numerical strength. It was not for direct immorality merely that this judgment of the Church was pronounced, though for that it was pronounced [1]; but for other matters also; as under some circumstances for marrying a Gentile [2]; for making idols [3]; for selling incense for the temples [4]; perhaps for teaching the art of fencing.[5] It is obvious that all this arrangement is that of a Church which was not engaged in counting its rank and file, but in securing good soldiers and servants of Jesus Christ, at whatever apparent cost. Nay, it should seem that the penalty of excommunication had been inflicted too freely in the early Church, and withdrawn too grudgingly; insomuch that one of the Constitutions [6] is expressly framed for the purpose of mitigating an evil which was proving itself of such magnitude as to call for interference. That Constitution begins with recommending the Bishop to be gentle, "not to be overhasty to thrust out and eject . . . not to be content with the testimony of less than three witnesses against the accused; and to examine the character and motives of those witnesses: for there are many," it adds, "who hate the brethren, and make it their business to scatter the flock of Christ; to receive the evidence of such men without sifting it, would be to break up the fold, to deliver it over as a prey to wolves, *i.e.* to evil spirits and to evil men, to Gentiles, Jews, and godless heretics; for ravening wolves instantly assail one who is cast out of the Church, counting his destruction their gain . . . and he who through a want of discrimination has been unjustly excommunicated, through despondency and dejection will either stray away to the heathen, or will get entangled in heresy, and become alienated altogether from the Church and from hope in God; fast bound in ungodliness; and thou all the while" (the Constitution is addressed to the Bishop), "the author of his ruin: for it is not right to be overready to cast a sinner out, and to be slow to receive him again on his repentance; to be prompt to cut off, but reluctant to heal . . . . Be assured, that he

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. xlvi.; Ad Nationes, I. § 5.
[2] Ad Uxorem, II. c. iii.
[3] De Idololatriâ c. v.
[4] § xi.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Constitut. II. c. xxi.

who casts out a brother wrongfully, or who does not admit him again on his turning back, is the murderer of his brother, and sheds his blood, as Cain did Abel's, and it will cry out against him to God . . . And so is it with him who is unjustly excommunicated by the Bishop" . . . with more to the same effect. From all which it should appear, that so far from the Primitive Church augmenting her forces by an array of atrocious criminals, persuaded to express penitence and receive Baptism, she was rather falling into the opposite extreme, of sometimes expelling, upon doubtful testimony, members that were really blameless.

To advert to the second insinuation respecting the expedients resorted to by the Christians to attach to themselves converts—the bribes they dispensed in the shape of alms. In speaking of the distribution of the revenues of the early Church Gibbon, you will recollect, remarks, "such an institution, which paid less regard to the merit than to the distress of the object, very materially conduced to the progress of Christianity. The Pagans, who were actuated by a sense of humanity, while they derided the doctrines, acknowledged the benevolence of the new sect. The prospect of immediate relief and of future protection *allured into its hospitable bosom* many of those unhappy persons whom the neglect of the world would have abandoned to the miseries of *want*, of sickness, and of old age."[1] Before I offer you any other remarks on this question, I must observe that Origen in his work against Celsus repudiates this insinuation in a manner which must satisfy us he had no fear of it. "No man can say that the early teachers of Christianity undertook their task for the sake of lucre. For sometimes they would not accept so much as their food; and if they were occasionally compelled to do so through want, they were content with mere necessaries, although there were many who would have been willing to furnish them with more."[2] No doubt the Fund of the Church, devoted as it was in great measure to relieving the indigence of members of the Church, might offer a temptation to the poor to avail themselves of it if they could. It would be idle to deny it. And though the objec-

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 347.

[2] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 9. Gibbon knows how to refer to this treatise of Origen's for purposes of his own.

tion comes with an ill grace from those who would represent the Christian congregations as composed pretty exclusively of the lowest of the people, who could not therefore be supposed to possess an exchequer that would furnish much means of corruption; still if the early Christians were not so entirely of that class (which I have shown was the case), they might possibly have a public purse which would prove a decoy to some. But those who managed the affairs of the early Christians were perfectly aware of this danger; were quite alive to the necessity of guarding the Church from an influx of mercenary converts. Thus Clemens Alexandrinus,[1] after having cautioned the teacher against acting on his part for the sake of lucre, or from any lower motive than a desire for the salvation of his hearers, goes on to say of the taught, "On the other hand, they who participate in the Divine Word must look to it, that they do not search it for curiosity's sake merely; approaching their subject as they might approach the edifices of a city; nor yet for the sake of *getting a share in this world's goods;* and under the knowledge that those who are consecrated to Christ, *are ready to communicate to others the necessaries of life.* But," adds Clemens, "such persons are hypocrites, and so let us pass them by"—a paragraph, which shows that the Christians of those days were on the alert against the abuse, and prepared to investigate the real object the novice had in view in professing himself a Christian. And the same fact we gather from a passage in Cyprian. It appears that one Fortunatianus, once a Bishop of Assuræ, but who had fallen away, having yielded to the temptation of sacrificing to the idol and so saving his life, after the danger was past, claimed to be admitted again to his Bishopric. Cyprian addresses a letter on this occasion to Epictetus apparently the successor of Fortunatianus, and to the people of Assuræ, in the course of which he remarks, "What wonder is it that those make light of our admonitions" (which seems to have been the case with Fortunatianus) "who have denied the Lord? They are bent" (the letter continues) "on *lucre*, and even at this moment are given to debauch, thus making it manifest that even formerly it was not religion they were looking to, *but their belly and their gain.* Therefore, God has applied to them this touch-

[1] Stromat. I. § i. p. 319.

stone, in order that they may no longer serve at the altar which they disgraced. We must watch, therefore, with all diligence, that these men act no more as Priests, who have fallen to a depth even beyond the lapsed laity themselves."[1] Here, again, you see the jealousy with which the Church guarded its own revenues. An unworthy person might, no doubt, introduce himself into it, nay even into the ministry of it, for the sake of a maintenance. St. Paul had himself foreseen the danger, when he required that the Bishop should "not be greedy of filthy lucre;" but then you observe, by the instance before you, what a scandal it was considered; how sure of a repulse the party would have been at the first, could the thoughts of his heart have been discovered; and how effectual an obstacle to his re-admission it was considered to be, in case he forfeited his position in the Church, as such a person would be very likely to do. In short, you perceive, that the authorities of the Church were as well aware of the snare, as we are ourselves; and as much bent upon protecting the Church from suffering by it, as we could ourselves be. And, therefore, we may safely conclude that no such result did practically ensue from the action of this fund, as Mr. Gibbon would persuade us, did. It might scarcely seem needful to say more in vindication of the Primitive Church from the suspicion of drawing her members by the tooth. But there is a case recorded by the same Cyprian, which very distinctly proves how considerately the Church was wont to proceed in the administration of this fund; how solicitous she was to protect herself from being imposed upon by pretenders to religion, whilst they were in reality seeking after the loaves and fishes. I had occasion to refer to this case before for another purpose. It had been submitted to Cyprian as a matter for his judgment, whether a player who still exercised his calling and taught it others, should be allowed to communicate with the Christian congregation to which he belonged. Cyprian decides against it, but adds, "if, however, he alleges that poverty drives him to this, his necessities may be relieved amongst those of others who are supported by the alms of the Church, only he must be content with frugal, howbeit with innocent victuals, (frugalioribus sed innocentibus cibis.) Nor *must he imagine that he is to be bought off* from

[1] Cyprian, Ep. lxiv. § 3.

his sins by a salary, (nec putet salario se esse redimendum ut a peccatis cessat,) when the gain is to be his, not ours. Withdraw him however, if possible, from this wicked course to better things; and let him be content with poor but honest provision, which the Church will offer him, (ut sit contentus ecclesiæ sumptibus, parcioribus quidem sed salutaribus.) Or if the Church with you" (he says to his correspondent) "has not the means, he may transfer himself to us, and receive with us such food and clothing as is necessary, and learn what is edifying in the Church, instead of teaching others what is deadly out of it."[1] Again, on another occasion, Cyprian writes to the Presbyters and Deacons in his absence to have a care of the poor. But what poor? "Such as have stood fast in the faith." And with what particular object? "That means may not be lacking unto them; and so *necessity* subdue those whom persecution has not shaken"[2] —the parties, you observe, to be kept just above want, lest that temptation should drive them astray. It should seem too, as we learn from the same author, that some little addition was occasionally made from this fund to eke out the scanty wages of one, who, whilst he exercised some subordinate office in the Church, still continued to follow a trade.[3] But surely no reasonable fault can be found with the administration of a fund conducted upon such principles as are here discovered; nor can any suspicion attach to it of being made an instrument for purchasing proselytes. But here again there is a Constitution to our purpose; for these Constitutions in many cases are very valuable as pointing out the issues of precepts and practices, of which we see the beginnings in passages of the Primitive Fathers; or at least they often exhibit the ends toward which they are practically tending. Thus the seventh chapter of the third book of the Apostolical Constitutions is on the subject of the widows of the Church; some of whom it censures, because instead of staying at home and conversing with God, they were running about in search after gain; and they had begged so shamelessly and been so successful in their mendicancy, "that they had caused people in general *to be more slow to contribute to the ecclesiastical fund.*[4] For they ought to be satisfied,"

[1] Cyprian, Ep. lxi.
[2] Ep. v. § 2.
[3] Ep. xxxviii. § 1.
[4] So I understand καὶ ἐξ ὧν ἀναι-

the Constitution continues, "by reason of the moderation of their wishes with the ecclesiastical allowance; whereas, they were gadding about, making for themselves a handsome purse, lending money at high interest, and thinking of nothing but Mammon." Here, therefore, it once more appears, that the dole of the Church was a bare maintenance and nothing more: nay, so small that those who were known to receive it, were still regarded by many as objects of charity; for otherwise, they could not have begged with the advantage they are here represented to do; people would have at once closed their doors against widows already well provided for. Moreover, the Constitution shows that the managers of the ecclesiastical fund were acting under a strong politico-economical check, even if no higher motive had influenced them; seeing that any abuses in the administration were sure to recoil upon the treasury, and reduce its amount; just as the notion which some time ago had obtained in this country, that Briefs were farmed and otherwise mismanaged, eventually almost dried up the supply, and naturally, though unhappily, perhaps, as events have since turned out, paved the way for their abolition.

There is yet another surmise of Gibbon's with respect to the materials of which the early Church was composed, akin to these last we have been considering, and meant, like them, to depreciate its character: and as the consideration of the fiscal question enters into this also, it may be convenient to mention, and reply to it here—the Fathers, you will observe, still furnishing us with the means of doing so: for I am engaged in representing to you the use of the Fathers, and at present, as it exhibits itself in the service they do on the *Evidences*, enabling us to supply arguments for the truth of Christianity, or to meet objections against it. "There is some reason likewise to believe," continues Gibbon, "that great numbers of infants, who, according to the inhuman practice of the times, had been exposed by their parents, were frequently rescued from death, baptized, educated, and maintained by the piety of the Christians, and at the expense of the public treasure" [1]—as though the Christian body, already described as replenished by atrocious criminals, who found more ready

σχύντως αἰτοῦσι καὶ ἁπλήστως λαμβάνουσιν ἤδη καὶ ὀκνοτέρους τοὺς πολλοὺς πρὸς τὸ διδόναι κατέστησαν.

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 347.

admission to the Church, than to the heathen temple itself, and by needy persons disposed to swallow the bribe which the Church's exchequer furnished, found another supply in a quarter no less humiliating to contemplate, in the infants that had been abandoned, and whom the Christians adopted, and quartered upon the ecclesiastical exchequer. Gibbon's authority for this is analogy—similar conduct of modern missionaries may be observed under the same circumstances—and he names those of China.[1] It is dangerous to charge one's memory with the contents of many volumes, and some of them ample ones, but I do not remember the slightest ground for this suggestion of Gibbon's in any Ante-Nicene Father whatever; nor do I believe, that any hint to that effect can be met with in any one of them. Whereas, I can bring several passages from them which would seem to be inconsistent with such a fact; I mean inconsistent with the fact that the Church was sensibly recruited from this source: for it is likely enough that a foundling or two might be reared by humane Christians under particular circumstances; as they occasionally were, even by humane heathens. Of course, in what I am about to say, I am not careful to clear the Christians from the charge of rescuing exposed infants from death, baptizing and rearing them, as though the thing was a reproach, whereas it would really have been an act of signal charity; but I am simply speaking to the fact, and replying to Gibbon, who would have his readers believe that Christianity, instead of making progress on adult minds by the force of evidence and reason, did in truth advance by catching its converts, and those, too, outcasts in their tenderest years, feeding and appropriating them, and so breeding them into Christians when they had no will or judgment of their own. Now I find Justin Martyr, when engaged in defending the Christians from the calumnies vulgarly circulated against them—one of which was, that in their secret assemblies they devoured the flesh of infants—I find him, I say, contending that so far were Christians from doing any such deed, that they taught the great sin of exposing children; and I further find him alleging, in aggravation of this sin, that the fate of these children commonly was, not to be rescued by Christians, but to be picked up by their fellow-heathens and reared for

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 347, note 144.

prostitution.[1] Is it credible that, had the Christians been in the habit of saving them from death for the purpose of raising up seed for the Church, he would have made no mention of the practice on an occasion which so strongly invited him to advert to it? a practice which would have placed the Christians in such an advantageous contrast with the heathens; the ordinary humanity of the Christian actually protecting the child from the unnatural barbarity of the heathen parent in abandoning it, or the baser cruelty of the heathen pander in preserving it. Again, I find Tatian assigning as a reason for quitting the heathens and uniting himself with the Christians, the superior morality of the latter; and in enumerating the vices of the former, which had inspired him with disgust, I hear him speaking of the exposure of their children and of the fate which usually awaited them, and which he represents to be the same as Justin does.[2] But neither does he drop the least allusion to any interference of the Church for the preservation of these infants; though, I repeat, his argument would naturally have led him to speak of it, had any such practice prevailed. It would have been making out a very strong case if he could have said, that whilst heathen parents left them to perish, or heathen panders saved them for the brothel, the Christians interposed to repair the mischief, and cherished them for the fold of Christ. There were many reasons why the Fathers should have claimed the merit for the Christians had it belonged to them, especially when writing Apologies for them; and none, why they should have suppressed it. Tertullian also reproaches the heathen with the crime of exposing their children, and dwells on the incestuous consequences which often resulted when they chanced to be picked up and reared through the compassion of some passing stranger,[3] contrasting such defilement with the purity which characterised the Christians; but he does not hint that the compassionate stranger was usually a Christian, or that in these children there was provided a nursery for the Church. Yet, had such been the case, it would have been precisely according to the style of Tertullian to make the very utmost of such an antithesis; the unnatural barbarity on the one side, the gratuitous humanity on the

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 27.
[2] Tatian, Oratio Contra Græcos, § 28.
[3] Tertullian, Apol. c. ix.

other. It would have been a subject which Tertullian above all the Fathers would have delighted to enlarge upon, and would have lavished upon it with a relish his most impassioned rhetoric. Yet he is silent. I could produce other testimony to the same effect,[1]—negative testimony, it is true, but the case does not very well admit of any other. You cannot expect the Fathers to make positive affirmation that the Church did not recruit its numbers from this source, if the practice never existed in their day; and they could not, of course, divine that it would be ever imputed to the Church. Nor is this all. There is an incident recorded by Cyprian which has been often quoted for other purposes, but which bears also on the question before us—the case of a little child, whose parents had fled in haste, (apparently from persecution, being Christians,) and left it in the hands of a nurse. The nurse took the deserted infant to the magistrates, (relictam nutrix detulit ad magistratus,) who administered to it bread steeped in wine, the remains of an idol offering. The tale goes on to tell of the mother of the child at length returning, resuming the care of her child, and carrying it with her to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, when, on the cup being given the child, it rejected it, the Eucharist not being found to remain in a body which had been defiled by having partaken of an idolatrous sacrifice.[2] Such is the history. But the feature of it to which I advert is this—that the deserted infant was not taken to the Church, to be supported out of the Church fund, even though it was the child of Christian parents, or at least of a mother who was a Christian, but was taken *to the magistrates*. This, I think, is an incident which, though not conclusive of the question, rather tends to show that the Christians were not disposed to appropriate deserted children to themselves, and in default of other converts make Christians of them. Then there is a Constitution which exhorts one or other of the brethren, who might happen to have no child of his own, to adopt an orphan child[3]; and another, which encourages the Bishop to cherish and protect such children, and have them taught a trade[4]—the provision in the latter case to be made for them, no doubt, out of the Church's fund, of which the Bishop was the chief admini-

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. iii. p. 265.
[2] Cyprian, De Lapsis, § xxv.
[3] Constitut. IV. c. i.
[4] c. ii.

strator. But these regulations are still unpropitious to Mr. Gibbon's theory, for they serve to prove that the Church had enough to do, and apparently much more than enough, in taking care of the orphans even of Christian parents, and never contemplated laying itself out for systematically gathering other outcast children about her. Indeed, such a drain upon her treasury would soon have become quite exhausting; for had parents, in that state of society, and in that condition of public feeling on the subject of the exposure of children, once found out that they might cast out their children with impunity, seeing that the Christians would not let them die, there is no telling the extent to which the abuse might not have proceeded.

In conclusion, I submit that the Fathers are *of use*, when they thus put us in possession of an intimate knowledge of the condition of the early Church, and thereby furnish us with the means of neutralizing the mischievous insinuations of an unscrupulous but wary assailant of the truth of that Gospel we desire to live and die by.

LECTURE IV.

The opinion of Sir James Mackintosh on Gibbon's sixteenth chapter. The statements of the latter to be corrected by a review of the early Fathers. Their testimony, 1°. To the *extent of the persecutions* of the Christians. The classification into ten great persecutions untenable. Inquiry whether the edicts of Nero and Domitian were repealed. Effect of those of Trajan, Hadrian, Antoninus. Christianity a capital offence from the time of Nero downwards. Martyrdom of Ignatius. Remarks of Tertullian on Trajan's edict. Subsequent activity of persecution. That at Lyons and Vienne a sample of others. The assertion of Origen respecting the number of martyrs relative, not positive. Motives in various quarters for setting persecution on foot.

I STILL pursue the subject of Evidences, and the manner in which the Fathers minister to this argument: and in doing so I shall now turn to the question of *persecution*.

There is a passage in the life of Sir James Mackintosh—himself, you will remember, a man of very liberal views—quoted by Mr. Milman in his edition of Gibbon, and which I had myself transcribed into my own copy before his edition appeared, for I thought it remarkable, coming from the author it did, to the following effect. "The sixteenth chapter," (*i. e.* of the history of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire,) "I cannot help considering as a very ingenious and specious but very disgraceful extenuation of the cruelties perpetrated by the Roman magistrates against the Christians. It is written in the most contemptibly factious spirit of prejudice against the sufferers; it is unworthy of a philosopher and a man of humanity. Let the narrative of Cyprian's death be examined. He had to relate the murder of an innocent man of advanced age, and in a station deemed venerable by a considerable body of the provincials of Africa, put to death because he refused to sacrifice to Jupiter. Instead of pointing the indignation of posterity against such an atrocious act of tyranny, he dwells with visible art on the small circumstances of decorum and politeness which attended this murder, and which he relates with as much parade as if they

were the most important particulars of the event. Dr. Robertson has been the subject of much blame for his zeal or supposed lenity towards the Spanish murderers and tyrants in America. That the sixteenth chapter of Mr. Gibbon did not excite the same or greater disapprobation is a proof of the unphilosophical and, indeed, fanatical animosity against Christianity, which was so prevalent during the latter part of the seventeenth century."[1]

I think, then, that the testimony of the early Fathers will go far to dissipate the impression made by this famous chapter of the historian of the Decline and Fall. I say dissipate the impression, for in dealing with Mr. Gibbon we must not reckon upon convicting him of positive falsehood or of inaccurate references; but, it may be, of so packing his materials as on the whole to leave a fair picture on the mind, a picture which can only be qualified by the substitution for it of another, drawn from materials as authentic as his own, and indeed for the most part from (I do not scruple to say it) a larger survey of the very same. For I am of opinion that a candid review of the writings of the early Fathers will correct many notions we may have derived from Mr. Gibbon, both as to the *extent*, as to the *intensity*, and as to the *nature* of the persecution encountered by the early Christians.

First, with reference to the *extent*, it is not very easy to determine the specific idea which Mr. Gibbon had upon this subject; but, on the whole, that which he seems desirous to leave on the minds of his readers probably is, that though partial persecutions of the Christians there were from time to time, there was none which deserved the name of a general persecution before Diocletian, about the beginning of the fourth century. No doubt the notion to which he studiously draws attention, that there were ten great persecutions, as set forth first by a writer of the fifth century, and afterwards followed by others, in correspondence with the ten plagues of Egypt, is a fanciful classification of them; too many, as Mosheim observes,[2] if *general* persecutions are meant; much too few, if *particular*. The truth seems to be, that whenever the first edict for an universal and contemporaneous attack upon the Christians throughout the provinces of the

[1] Life of Sir James Mackintosh, vol. i. p. 244.

[2] Mosheim, De Rebus Christianorum ante Constant. sæc. I. § xxvi. p. 98.

Roman Empire might have been promulgated, a system of persecution sometimes smothered, sometimes breaking out in greater or less severity in various quarters of the world, now in one part, now in another, according to the temper of the Emperor of the day, or much more frequently according to that of the local magistrate, or even of the populace itself, was almost constantly at work or in agitation; the doctrines and the habits of the Christians being such as would readily furnish a plea for an assault upon them under the sanction of the laws; and even such laws as were meant in some measure to protect them, and framed by humane Emperors, so loosely worded as to answer this purpose very inadequately. Laws were made against them by Nero and Domitian, the character of which is bespoken by that of their authors; for Tertullian, in his Apology, speaks of previous laws which were in part frustrated by Trajan.[1] But if such laws there were, they must have been made for the Empire, and accordingly any and every part of it must have been liable to their action. And however the persecution under them might have been, and probably was, most intense at Rome, a door was opened to it everywhere. I do not think that there is any evidence that those edicts of Nero and Domitian had been abrogated. Mosheim says they had; those of Nero by the Senate, those of Domitian by Nerva[2]; but he quotes no authority. Lardner more cautiously says, I suppose they had been abrogated.[3] On the contrary, in Tertullian's first book "Ad Nationes," there is a passage, quoted by Bishop Kaye[4] —whose views, as far as he discovers them, coincide with my own, of which I was not aware when I drew up this Lecture —in Tertullian's first book "Ad Nationes," there is a passage, I say, which expressly affirms, that whilst all the other edicts of Nero had been repealed, that against the Christians alone remained in force—"et tamen permansit, omnibus erasis, hoc solum institutum Neronianum."[5] Indeed, were it otherwise, how could Tertullian use the expression in the Apology, "quas Trajanus ex parte frustratus est"? Trajan

[1] Quales ergo leges istæ, quas adversus nos exsequuntur impii . . .? quas Trajanus ex parte frustratus est.—Tertullian, Apol. c. v.

[2] Neronis nimirum leges Senatus, Domitiani Nerva imperator, abrogaverat.—Mosheim, De Rebus Christianorum, sæc. II. § viii. p. 231.

[3] Lardner, Credibility, Pt. II. Heathen Testimonies, ch. ix. § 4.

[4] Bp. Kaye's Tertullian, p. 108 *et seq.* 3rd Ed.

[5] Tertullian, Ad Nationes, I. § 7.

could not have winked at the evasion of laws which had no existence. Or how could he complain that when the simple statement of the truth met all objections that could be made against the Christians, they were then borne down by the authority of the laws, and the prejudice that when laws had once been established they were not to be altered: this last an idea, be it observed, which he is at much pains to correct[1]—a superfluous labour, if these statutes had been already abrogated? And how could he speak of the Romans spending their fury on the Christians partly in obedience to their own inclinations, and partly in obedience to the laws[2]? Neither is it a safe inference from Pliny's letter to Trajan that there could be no edicts in force against the Christians when Pliny came into his province, because if there had been, he would have known what to do without writing to Trajan for advice, though this inference is drawn both by Mosheim,[3] Lardner,[4] and Gibbon.[5] On the contrary, I should infer, from a phrase which occurs in that letter, "Cognitionibus Christianorum interfui nunquam, ideo nescio quid et quatenus aut puniri soleat, aut quæri,"[6] "I have never been present at any trials of Christians, so that I know not well what is the subject-matter of punishment or inquiry," a circumstance on which Pliny partly grounds his application to Trajan—I say that I should infer from this phrase not that there were no edicts against Christians then existing; but that there undoubtedly were such, only that Pliny had never happened to see them actually executed. His perplexity seems to have arisen not from the absence of laws, but from his humanity revolting at carrying out severe ones against parties often of tender years ("teneri," "omnis ætatis,") and in numbers very great, "visa est mihi res digna consultatione, maxime propter periclitantium numerum." I can have very little doubt, therefore, that the edicts of Nero and Domitian were in force, and had been hanging over the heads of the Christians till then. These laws in their action, it appears from Trajan's answer to Pliny, that Emperor somewhat mitigated, enacting indeed that the Christians upon conviction of being such

[1] Apol. c. iv.
[2] c. xxxvii.
[3] Mosheim, De Rebus Christianorum, sæc. II. § viii. p. 231.
[4] Lardner, Credibility, Pt. II. Heathen Testimonies, c. ix. § 4.
[5] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 418.
[6] Plin. Epistolar. lib. X. Ep. xcvii.

should be punished, but that they should not be sought for; and moreover, that the bill of information should be signed by the party preferring it.[1] Such was the condition of the law with respect to the Christians as Trajan left it. Trajan's law does not seem to have been substantially changed, though it is sometimes represented to have been so, by the rescript of Hadrian; the sole effect of the latter appearing to be to put down mere mob law with regard to the Christians, and to place them more effectually under Trajan's; the gravamen alleged by Serenius Granianus, Proconsul of Asia, which produces this rescript,[2] being that it was unjust to put the Christians to death merely to gratify the clamours of the people, which, it appears, had been the practice of late; and the corrective administered by Hadrian being that they should be legally tried, and if they were proved to have committed anything contrary to the laws (and it was contrary to the laws to be a Christian under Trajan's edict) they should be dealt with accordingly—at the same time, when the charge turned out to be only a calumny, the author of it was to be punished.[3] The purpose of this edict, as I have said, is to rescue the Christians from being made victims of the populace, and to require that they be disposed of by law, but not to alter the law itself. With this additional caution attached to it, Trajan's law now came into the hands of Antoninus Pius, who in his turn, in his edict to the Commune of Asia, (if on the authority of Eusebius we ascribe this edict to him,[4] and Lardner takes this view,[5]) refers to the edict of Hadrian, and fully confirms it. There are incidents in the account of the martyrdom of Polycarp,[6] and in the history of the persecution at Lyons,[7] both of which events took place in the reign of Aurelius, that would lead to the conclusion that under that Emperor it was still against the law to be a Christian, or in other words that Trajan's edict, founded primarily upon Nero's, still held good. Commodus made few martyrs; but the case of Apollonius[8] seems to show that the law continued as it was, though in this instance the clause of it added by Hadrian, and confirmed by Antoninus Pius, which punished

[1] Plin. Epistolar. lib. X. Ep. xcviii.
[2] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iv. c. 8.
[3] c. 9.
[4] c. 13.
[5] Lardner, Credibility, Pt. II. Heathen Testimonies, c. xiv. § 3.
[6] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iv. c. 14.
[7] v. c. 1.
[8] v. c. 21.

the informer, was also acted on, and he put to death as well as his victim.[1] And if we examine the cases of persecution recorded by Eusebius, as occurring under subsequent Emperors, as that of Basilides under Severus[2]; that of the heads of the Churches under Maximin[3]; that of Nemesion, under Decius,[4] though Decius seems to have aggravated matters by some sanguinary edict of his own[5]; that of Dionysius and those in Egypt, under Valerian[6]; that of Marinus at Cæsarea, under Gallienus[7]; down to Diocletian himself; we shall see reason to believe, from expressions let fall in these several histories, that Eusebius considered the law, which constituted the profession of Christianity as a crime, to be constantly in force, and the several parties to be proceeded against from time to time under that law.

On the whole, therefore, my impression is, that Christianity was still a capital offence from Nero's time downwards, or, as Tertullian expressly represents it, "non licet esse eos,"[8] "it was not legal for Christians to live," that their religion contrasted with that of the Jews, as not being a licita religio,[9] that Minucius Felix speaks with the accuracy of a lawyer, when he puts in the mouth of Cæcilius a phrase describing the Christians as "homines illicitæ factionis,"[10] and that Mosheim's phrase is more literally true than he himself understood it, "Nero Imperator Christianos Romæ degentes atrocissimis legibus et suppliciis aggressus erat. Ejus vestigia sequentium Imperatorum plerique per tria sæcula, diversâ licet ratione, presserunt."[11] Nero and Domitian might hunt the Christians out; Trajan might only condemn them when they fell in his

[1] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 21. There seems to have been something peculiar in this case. "The charge was made out of season," is the singular expression of Eusebius.

[2] vi. c. 5.

[3] c. 28.

[4] c. 41.

[5] Thus in the case of the martyrs of Alexandria, the expression occurs, "The persecution with us did not begin with the imperial edict, but preceded it a whole year."—Ibid. And again, "But soon a change in the Government towards us was announced" (*i. e.* Philip was dead, and was succeeded by Decius) "and great danger threatened us. The decree had arrived, very like that foretold by our Lord," &c.—Ibid.

[6] vii. c. 11.

[7] c. 15. Gallienus appears to have favoured the Christians personally, and to have even published edicts in their favour, and allowed them their cemeteries (c. 13), but still to have left the standing laws against them unrepealed (c. 15). Gibbon seems to admit this fact, vol. ii. p. 454.

[8] Tertullian, Apol. c. iv.

[9] c. xxi.

[10] Minucius Felix, c. viii.

[11] Mosheim, De Rebus Christianor. sæc. I. § xxvi. p. 97.

way; Hadrian and Antoninus might even punish those who accused them falsely; it was necessary even for the safety of the heathens themselves that some check should be put upon vague charges of Christianity; but the law still substantially was, that to be a Christian was to be *guilty of a capital crime*, whether that law were executed or not. And this view of the question accords, I think, with the representation we find of it in a passage of the Apology of Tertullian to which I have referred already. "Quales ergo leges istæ, quas adversus nos soli *exsequuntur* impii, injusti, turpes, vani, dementes? Quas Trajanus ex parte *frustratus est* vetando inquiri Christianos, quas nullus Adrianus, quanquam curiositatum omnium explorator, nullus Vespasianus, quanquam Judæorum debellator, nullus Pius, nullus Verus *impressit*."[1] "What sort of laws are those which none *put in force* (exsequuntur) against us, but the impious, the unjust, the vile, the vain, the mad? of which Trajan partly *frustrated the effect* by forbidding inquiry to be made for the Christians, which neither Hadrian, though an explorer of everything curious; nor Vespasian, though the conqueror of the Jews; nor Pius, nor Verus *carried into execution*" (impressit): the several terms "exsequuntur," "frustratus est," "impressit," all having reference to laws already existing, which these several emperors, with all their humanity, mind, would not *abrogate* according to Tertullian, but only did not enforce. Indeed in a previous sentence relating to M. Aurelius, this is alleged in so many words,—"Qui sicut non palam ab ejusmodi hominibus pœnam dimovit, ita alio modo palam dispersit, adjectâ etiam accusatoribus damnatione, et quidem tetriore"—"which emperor, though he did not publicly abrogate the punishments directed against the Christians, did publicly avert them by another method, subjecting the accusers to punishment even yet more severe." One would have thought that the simple way of relieving the Christians, if the Emperors had been in earnest in their feeling for them, would have been to rescind the laws that were against them. But this step, it should seem, the most merciful of the Emperors hesitated to take; whether having misgivings themselves about the principles and proceedings of the Christians, which were of necessity involved in a certain degree of mystery, and which might be

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. v.

brought into bad repute by those of the heretics; whether reluctant to afford a plausible pretext for the suspicion that they were themselves lukewarm towards the gods of their own country; or whether overruled by strong popular opinion, which was utterly hostile to the Christians. Origen appears to me to write with this impression on his mind in his treatise against Celsus. He is detailing one of the many charges against the Christians which Celsus advances, namely, that of their acting and teaching in a clandestine manner, and "no wonder they do so," he continues, still stating Celsus' argument, "it is to avert from themselves *the punishment of death which hangs over their heads.*"[1] The accusation is a general one, against Christians not of one generation, but of every generation, and accordingly the law against which they had to protect themselves by such precaution not a temporary, but a permanent cause of alarm; however it might be more actively enforced at one time than at another. And indeed, whilst Origen was writing the work in which this language is used, there was, he tells us, neither actual persecution,[2] nor prospect of it; the powers at that time happening to have no passion for blood. We should arrive at the same conclusion from an expression which drops from him in the "De Principiis," when, speaking of the rapid growth of the Christians, he adds, that this occurred in spite of the hatred in which they were held by idolaters, and of "the *risk they ran*, besides such hatred, of being put to death"[3]—as though, under the circumstances of the law, the profession of Christianity at once involved a capital *hazard*.

Accordingly we find, as we might expect to find under the circumstances I have described, that under all these Emperors, whether humane or otherwise, persecution was in fact going on more or less—why should it not, when they would not plainly declare it to be illegal? If they plausibly encumbered it with indirect checks, those checks were easily evaded; and when a provincial magistrate owed the Christian cause a grudge or wished to please the people (as that class were often disposed to do in order to bribe them not to expose their mis-

[1] Οὐ μάτην τοῦτο ποιοῦσιν, ἅτε διωθούμενοι τὴν ἐπηρτημένην αὐτοῖς δίκην τοῦ θανάτου.— Origen, Contra Celsum, I. § 3.

[2] Ὅτι δὲ οὐδὲ τὸ τῶν ἔξωθεν δέος τὸ σύνθημα ἡμῶν διακρατεῖ, δῆλον ἐκ τοῦ καὶ τοῦτο, βουληθέντος Θεοῦ, πεπαῦσθαι ἤδη χρόνῳ πλείονι. — Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 15.

[3] Ἐπὶ θανάτῳ δὲ πρὸς τῷ μισεῖσθαι κινδυνευόντων.—De Principiis, IV. § 1.

deeds) by proceeding against them, he could easily find a way to do it without incurring much or any risk himself. For certain it is that under Trajan there was in fact persecution—"a great persecution in most places," is the phrase which Eusebius uses to describe that which caused Pliny's address to that Emperor.[1] In that reign it was that Ignatius suffered; condemned at Antioch, executed at Rome; so far from clandestine was the transaction. It may be said that he was voluntarily brought before Trajan (ἑκουσίως ἤγετο,)[2] but it was ἑκὼν ἀέκοντί γε θυμῷ, he was constrained by a sense of honour; he had led others to their death by the principles he had taught them[3]; how could he flinch from avowing them to be his own? The mockery of mercy which the law of Trajan exhibited, is exposed as it deserved to be by Tertullian. "The Christians are not to be searched for, but to be punished when found! What a necessary contradiction is this! He forbids them to be searched for, because they are innocent; he consigns them to punishment, because they are guilty. He spares and he despatches; he dissembles and he denounces! Why do you embarrass yourself with your own decree? If you condemn, why do you not search? If you do not search, why do you not acquit them? Military posts are established throughout the provinces for detecting robbers. Against traitors and public enemies every man takes up arms. The search, in their case, extends even to their companions and accomplices. But for the Christian, and for him only, no search is to be made, and yet he is to be accused; as though the search was good for anything, if it was not for his accusation."[4] It is evident from this indignant remonstrance, how poor a boon the Christians found themselves to have gained in the edict of Trajan. Again, persecution was active under Hadrian, however he might have personally had no ill-will towards them, persecution so cruel and unjust as to call forth, we have seen, a request from one of his own governors, Serenius Granianus, for his interposition: and it was to this Emperor that Quadratus and Aristides addressed their Apologies, documents always drawn forth by hard times.[5] Under the Antonines, persecution was still on the alert. The first Apology of Justin

[1] Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 33.
[2] Martyr. Ignat. § 2.
[3] Ibid.
[4] Tertullian, Apol. c. ii.
[5] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iv. c. 3.

Martyr, which was the effect of it, bears testimony to its severity under Antoninus Pius; his very prologue setting forth that Justin made that appeal "in behalf of men unjustly hated and persecuted, he being himself one of them; and the whole tenour of it bespeaking that the persecution against which he was pleading, was to the death—"You can do no more than put us to death."[1] Under Aurelius, matters were yet worse. At this period Justin's second Apology dates; and his argument in it indicates the sufferings of the Christians at Rome to have been then most lively at the hands of Urbicus, a city magistrate, of whose proceedings he gives some details, with the names of several of his victims, and the circumstances of their conviction,[2] and expresses fears for himself, as it proved, not without reason.[3] The same reign drew forth the Apology of Athenagoras; that again bears testimony to the activity of a deadly persecution no less than Justin's. "The loss of goods and credit, the Christians knew how to bear, and to him who had defiled one cheek to turn the other, and to give the cloak when the coat had been taken, but they were attacked in life and limb."[4] Accordingly, Justin fell at Rome; Polycarp and others at Smyrna; a multitude of persons of either sex with Pothinus, the Bishop of Lyons, at their head at Lyons and Vienne in Gaul. So wide-wasting was the scourge in this reign.[5] Again under Severus, though he, as had been the case with some of his predecessors, had no vindictive feelings against the Christians himself, the war against the Christians was carried on with even greater fury than ever. The Apology of Tertullian, which was then put forth, bears the most unequivocal testimony to this fact—a document not written in a spirit of exaggeration of the wrongs done them[6]; indeed in a spirit, so far as the imperial authority was concerned,

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 45.

[2] II. §§ 1, 2, 3.

[3] § 3.

[4] Εἰς τὰ σώματα καὶ τὰς ψυχάς.—Athenagoras, Legat. pro Christianis, § 1.

[5] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 1.

[6] Tertullian, it may be observed, in an age when the martyr was so honourable a title, is chary of it. Thus, writers of a later period have classed Irenæus among the martyrs; not so Tertullian, though evidently having the most friendly feeling towards him; and though ascribing the title of martyr to Justin, whom he names with him: "Ut Justinus philosophus et martyr, ut Miltiades Ecclesiarum sophista, ut Irenæus omnium doctrinarum curiosissimus explorator."—Adv. Valentin. c. v. See Dodwell, Dissertat. in Irenæum, III. § xxi.

rather disposed to extenuate than inflame; as appears from a passage I have already had occasion to quote[1]; and even in relation to the local magistrates, the governors of Proconsular Africa, to whom it is probably addressed, though the proximate movers of the mischief, it speaks in language of moderation, imputing their conduct to their ignorance of the Christian character, at once their condemnation and their excuse,[2] rather than to any malignant feeling. Yet what scenes of suffering does it open! The Christians, compelled by torture to renounce their confession[3]; crucified; beheaded; thrown to wild beasts; burned; condemned to the mines; banished to the islands.[4] The fourth book of the Stromata of Clemens[5] incidentally demonstrates that persecution, during this same period of which Tertullian speaks, had also broken out in the quarters where his lot was cast. It is the property of the true Gnostic (whose character he is teaching and recommending) to be above persecution[6]: even virtuous heathens have attained to this high estate in a degree: "pound the husk of Anaxarchus, if you will, you do not pound Anaxarchus"[7]: "but the Church is full of persons who have meditated all their lives a death which quickens them unto Christ, as well men as discreet women"[8]: "the Lord drank the cup; the Apostles imitate him; the Gnostics them"[9]: "why are not Christians rescued from above? because no harm is done them; they are removed by a quick migration to God"[10]; and much more to the same effect. I merely hint it, to show that Clemens writes with persecution about him. Under Caracalla, persecution was still doing its work, as the "Ad Scapulam" of Tertullian makes evident, for that address bears internal marks of having been composed after the death of Severus, and probably during the life of Caracalla, whose nurse nevertheless, it should seem from an expression let fall in it, had been a Christian.[11] Origen, who lived in this and in several succeeding reigns, still was familiar with persecution, (however there might be a lull when he was writing the work itself, which supplies the authority,) and to an objection of the Jew in

[1] Apol. c. v.
[2] c. i.
[3] c. ii.
[4] c. xii.
[5] Clem. Alex. Stromat. IV. § iii. p. 568, *et seq.*
[6] § vii. p. 587.
[7] § viii. p. 589.
[8] p. 590.
[9] § ix. p. 597.
[10] § xi. pp. 598, 599.
[11] Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, c. iv.

Celsus against the conduct of Jesus, that any god or demon, or prudent man, on foreseeing that troubles were approaching, would get out of their way, replies by citing instances to the contrary, such as Socrates and Leonidas, and Paul; and then adds, "And many *in our own time*, aware that if they confessed Christianity, they should be put to death, but if they denied it, they should be set free and have their property restored, nevertheless despised life, and willingly *took their deaths for religion's sake.*"[1] Whenever and wherever Hippolytus wrote, whether in Italy or Arabia, whether under Maximin or Decius, his pen bears witness to persecution. In his commentary on the History of Susanna, whom he considers a type of Christ, the two elders represent the two adverse parties of Jew and Gentile, yet both are agreed on the subject of destroying the Saints, whom they watch to the house of God, and then seize and drag them before the tribunals, and condemn them to death. Such is its language.[2] Under Decius, Gallus, Volusianus, Valerian, persecution was not only alive, but rampant; as the writings of Cyprian, who lived under all those Emperors, and was put to death under the last of them, abundantly testify. In him we read of the Christians being driven into exile, and their goods confiscated[3]; of some, whose names are given, dying in prison of starvation[4]; of the arrival of antichrist being realised in the times of Gallus and Volusianus[5]; of their consignment to the mines[6]; of virgins and boys being amongst the victims[7]; of Xystus and four Deacons suffering death on the 8th of the Ides of August[8]; of the havock of the brethren, of the multiplied losses of that once numerous people[9]; and much more to the same effect.

So ample is the evidence of the extent of persecution, though I have produced only a small portion of that evidence during the first three centuries; scarcely a Father we possess during that period failing directly or indirectly to give proof of it; and indeed, it is a remark of Eusebius in the Preface to the fifth book of his history, introductory to the Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne to their brethren in Asia and

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 17.
[2] Hippolytus, In Susannam, p. 276, Ed. Fabric.
[3] Cyprian, Ep. xviii.
[4] Ep. xxi.
[5] Ep. lv.
[6] Epp. lxxvii. lxxx.
[7] Epp. lxxvii. § 6, lxxxi. § 3; De Lapsis, § ii.
[8] Ep. lxxxii.
[9] De Lapsis, § iv.

Phrygia given in that book, and to which I have had occasion to allude, "that one may infer by conjecture the multitude of martyrs there must have been throughout the world, from the events which occurred in one single community"—as though the persecution in Gaul, which happened thus to be recorded, was only a sample of what was going on elsewhere, but with less notoriety. And to all this Gibbon would oppose a casual expression of Origen, "who from his experience as well as reading, was intimately acquainted with the history of the Christians," and who "declares in the most express terms that the number of martyrs was very inconsiderable [1]; his authority alone sufficient to annihilate that formidable army of martyrs," &c.[2] And yet it is strange, that when it answers his purpose, Gibbon can dwell upon the style of a Father, as on that of Tertullian for instance, with vast parade in order to neutralize the force of testimony, which he dislikes; whilst here, because the phrase suits him, he would have us believe that Origen — Origen of all writers in the world—is the most careful of his terms, and the most exact in his computations. But that is true of Gibbon, which was said by Tertullian of another, and of a class, "occasiones sibi sumpsit quorundam verborum, ut hæreticis fere mos est, simplicia quæque torquere." [3] And yet what are the circumstances of the case? Celsus had charged the Christians with being a mere seditious confederacy, of which Christ was the head; as he had before charged the Jews with being a mere seditious confederacy, of which Moses was the head. To which Origen replies, "Touching the Christians, they, having been taught that they were not to avenge themselves of their enemies, observe a mild and gentle polity. Accordingly, that which they could not have effected, even had they been permitted to fight, and had they been ever so powerful, they were enabled to accomplish by God who always fights for them, and puts a timely stop to those who rise up against the Christians, and desire to slay them. Yet, for the sake of a memento, and in order that seeing a few contending for their religion, they may be the more approved, and may despise death, a few of them from time to time, in numbers readily reckoned, have died for the Christian faith; God *having taken care that their*

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 8.
[2] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 427.
[3] Tertullian, Adv. Hermogenem, c. xix.

whole race should not be exterminated. For it was his pleasure that they should continue, and that the whole earth should be filled with their salutary and wholesome doctrine." So that what Origen affirms is this, that the number of those who suffered martyrdom was inconsiderable, compared with the whole Christian body—such a number as would lead to no fears for the extermination of the sect, patient as it was—the assertion relative, not positive[1]—a very different thing from Gibbon's representation of it—and an assertion, it may be added, made at the time when the Christian world happened to be blessed with a more than common calm, as appears from several passages in the treatise against Celsus[2]; a circumstance, which might produce its effect on the pen of the writer at the moment, and which ought to be taken into account in estimating the force of a particular phrase used by him.

The Emperors were by no means the sole or even the chief enemies the Christians had to dread. Several of them were indifferent or even favourably disposed to them. But there were other quarters from which persecution issued, far more fatal than the emperors—the *local magistrates* and the *populace*. Origen points to this plainly enough in the continuation of the passage just cited. "God," says he, "took thought for the faithful, by his own single will dispersing every plot which was formed against them, so that neither emperors (*οἱ βασιλεῖς*) nor local governors (*οἱ κατὰ τόπους ἡγούμενοι*) nor the populace (*οἱ δῆμοι*) could be influenced against them further."[3] In another passage of the same treatise, he enlarges still more the catalogue of their assailants—"the Roman Senate, the Emperors for the time being, the army, the populace, and the kindred of the believers."[4] And again in another, where he is arguing for the Divinity of Jesus from the wonderful manner in which his religion had surmounted all the obstacles presented to its progress, he says, that "he overcame every hindrance which opposed itself to the dis-

[1] Just as on another occasion, in a passage which has, however, escaped Mr. Gibbon's notice, he represents the Christians as "very few," though in numerous other places in the same treatise, as well as elsewhere in his works (see the passages to this effect quoted from Origen in Lect. I. 2nd Series), he had said the direct contrary—but "very few" he means, as the context proves, when compared with the whole population of the Roman Empire.—Contra Celsum, VIII. § 69.

[2] III. § 15; VIII. §§ 44. 70.

[3] III. § 8.

[4] I. § 3.

persion of his doctrine, emperors, governors, the Roman Senate, magistrates in all parts, and the populace."[1] It was from some of these latter regions, that the storm principally came. Doubtless, among the local magistrates there were men of humanity, who so far from wishing to persecute the Christians, did their best to shield them from persecution. The Apologists make honourable mention of several such; and it is a feature in the testimony of the Fathers, which stamps it with credit, and disposes us to receive it with confidence when it complains of wrongs done, that it should be thus candid and dispassionate, and not condemn its supposed enemies in the gross. Thus Tertullian[2] expressly speaks of the subterfuges to which merciful magistrates had recourse in order to avoid shedding Christian blood; of one Cincius Severus, who suggested to the Christians, how they should frame their answers on their trials, with a view to their acquittal; of one Vespronius Candidus, who, when the mob clamoured for the death of a Christian, replied that it would be out of order to yield to such violence, and dismissed him; of one Asper, who let a Christian go, when he began to flinch from the torture, without compelling him to do sacrifice, and expressed his own sorrow for having gone into the case at all; of one Pudens, who discovering that the charge was brought against the prisoner by a conspiracy, tore up the record of accusation, and refused to hear the matter. And in more general terms, he tells of the magistrates exhorting the Christian prisoners brought before them to deny their profession, saying to them, "Save thy life," "Do not throw thy life away;"[3] though here we may observe, we have evidence how strong must have been the law and the popular cry against the Christians, when even compassionate *magistrates* were driven to shifts and evasions to spare them. But if there were some magistrates thus humane, what multitudes must there have been in the Roman provinces without any such touch of pity, only too glad to work the law as it stood, nay, perhaps, with some personal animosity against the Christians to gratify; as in the case of Herminianus, Governor of Cappadocia, who was provoked, Tertullian tells us,[4] by the conversion of his wife, to wreak his spleen on the

[1] Contra Celsum, II. § 79.
[2] Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, c. iv.
[3] Scorpiace, c. xi.
[4] Ad Scapulam, c. iii.

Christians; or with some lurking apprehension of the people's displeasure (which they could often ill afford to incur) if they allowed them to escape. "Torment us, good my lords," is Tertullian's exclamation to the magistrates, "rack us, crush us in the dust, you will be all the more acceptable to the mob for immolating the Christians."[1] Look, for instance, at the temper displayed by Urbicus, he too a Prætor of the city, as discovered in the second Apology of Justin. He gets at the fact of one Ptolemy being a Christian, by stealth and the evidence of a person who betrays him. On another party, one Lucius, presuming to put a question to Urbicus on behalf of Ptolemy, the reply of the magistrate is, "Thou too art one of them," and he also is condemned. A third party comes up, and is involved in the same affair, probably by some such incaution as the last, and he also suffers the same fate.[2] This is at Rome, the very seat of the government; and yet we should gather from Justin's language, that he considered the case to be unknown to the Emperor[3] or the Senate,[4] and that he composed his Apology chiefly for the purpose of exposing so flagrant a proceeding on the part of an officer of justice, and exciting some indignation at the iniquity of it. What then must have been the abuses of the magistrates in their transactions with the Christians in the remote provinces of the empire! We happen to have a case very similar to this of Urbicus, relating to the Prefect of Lyons, recorded in the Fragment of the Epistle of that Church. One Vettius Epagathus, touched by the injustice to which the Christians were exposed by the magistrates, begged to be heard in their defence. But the Prefect would listen to no such proposal, simply contenting himself with asking him whether he was a Christian, and on his confession, adding him to the number of martyrs.[5] What check, indeed, was there upon these provincial magistrates? We know from other sources how audaciously they were in the habit of running riot at a distance. Look, for instance, at the manner in which Verres administered the province of Sicily—a province almost at the very doors of Rome. At what did he scruple? giving corrupt judgment in causes that came before him; inflicting illegal

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. 1.
[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. II. § 2.
[3] Σοὶ τῷ αὐτοκράτορι.—§ 2.
[4] Ὦ Ῥωμαῖοι.—§ 1.
[5] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 3.

and tyrannical punishments; extorting enormous revenues; plundering plate and statues; fleecing the Sicilians in short, to the amount of some £400,000 sterling. It was a mere chance that there was a Cicero to bring his transgressions to light, and that he was willing to undertake the office. But for this nothing would have been known of his dark deeds. Nay, there is an amusing instance in the case of Cicero himself of the little interest the people of Rome seemed to take in the affairs of the provinces. He had been Quæstor of this same island; and indeed, it was probably this circumstance that gave him the concern for its future fortunes, which prompted him to defend it against Verres. He acquitted himself, as he thought, in his office wonderfully well. He landed at Puteoli on his return home, imagining that all Rome was ringing with his praises. A friend accosts him, and asks him, what news from Rome? He came from the provinces. From Africa, perhaps? says another. No, replies he, pettishly, from Sicily. How, said a third, who stood by, and wished to be thought wiser than his neighbours; how, don't you know, he is Quæstor of Syracuse? And what is Cicero's reflection? That this little mortification did him more good than if he had received all the compliments he expected; for it made him consider, that the people of Rome had dull ears, but quick eyes, and that it was his business to keep himself always in their sight, not to be so solicitous how to make them hear of him, as how to make them see him: so that from this moment he resolved to stick close to the forum, and to live perpetually in the view of the city.[1] Was it likely that the wrongs of the Christians in a remote part of the empire, in Africa, *e. g.* would trouble such a people as this; or that the magistrates of that country would feel themselves under any particular awe of their masters at home; whatever excesses they might commit against that defenceless body? Moreover, where the sale of Libelli or certificates of exemption was in their hands, were they to be expected to forbear the active working of all the enginery of persecution, calculated as it was to raise the price of those certificates, and to enable them to fill their pockets to almost any extent?[2]

But even had all the provincial magistrates been as well

[1] Pro Plancio, § 26; Middleton's Life of Cicero, vol. i. p. 65. 4to.

[2] Cyprian, Ep. lii. § 14.

disposed towards the Christians, and as dead to the temptations of money, as they were notoriously the contrary, still there was another party to persecution even more difficult to deal with than these, for they were evidently often above the laws,[1] the *populace*. There were various causes which excited them. The sanguinary taste engendered in them by the amphitheatre was gratified. The universal shout from the spectators of "Christianos ad leonem,"[2] was not prompted simply by a hatred of the Christians, but by an inveterate love for these scenes of butchery. What a picture do the Fathers give us of the details of the arena! Persons rushing to devour the beasts that had been slaughtered, still reeking with the gore of the gladiator they had despatched before their own lives were forfeited—the boar smeared with the blood of the miserable man he had ripped up, thus seized on for a meal—others again hastening to catch the life blood as it issued from the wound of the dying man as a specific for epilepsy.[3] In the pause from the games at noon, some miscreant dressed up as Mercury, amidst the laughter of the crowd, testing the bodies of the victims by a red-hot caduceus, to see whether they were really dead,[4] death being sometimes assumed[5]; and another in the habit of Pluto, dragging out the corpses of the combatants with his mallet in his hand to pound out of them any remains there might be of life, before he conveyed them to the infernal regions.[6] What an appetite for horrors on the part of the people does all this testify, this mixture of sport and bloodshed, and what food for it were the Christians!

Then the *superstition* of the populace inflamed them further. Whatever calamity the state happened to be suffering under, flood, drought, earthquake, famine, or pestilence, was imputed to the Christians[7]; the heathen priests, whose altars were deserted and their gains reduced, fostering the delusion. Then a natural horror was excited amongst them by interested parties of the secret crimes said to be committed in the assemblies of the Christians; their feasts on human flesh, and indulgence in the grossest incest.[8] Then, in many

[1] Tertullian, Ad Scapulam, c. iv.
[2] De Polycarpi Martyrio, § xii.; Tertullian, De Resurrec. Carnis, c. xxii.; Cyprian, Ep. lv. § 6.
[3] Tertullian, Apol. c. ix. [4] c. xv.
[5] Ad Nationes, I. § 10.
[6] Ibid.
[7] Apol. c. xl.; Cyprian, Ad Demetrianum, § ii.
[8] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 1.

instances, the trades of the people suffered by the progress of the Christian cause. Their worldly *interests*, therefore, stimulated them to exterminate the Christians, if they could. The makers of shrines for Diana of Ephesus were the types of future multitudes in their feelings and in their mode of prosecuting them. Indeed, it is curious to see in how many cases the great disturbing forces, which bear on Christianity on a large scale, as represented in the Fathers of the first three centuries, are found in incipient action in the history of the Acts of the Apostles. Thus the makers of idols, a very numerous class of mechanics amongst the heathens, including workers in metals as well as wood, manufacturers of amulets, charms,[1] dealers in incense[2]; builders employed in the erection and repair of temples, of which the number was enormous; painters, gilders, weavers; all, in short, who found a bread by decorating them when built; the multitude of tradesmen, for whose articles of merchandise the heathen festivals created a demand[3]; the still larger class, perhaps, connected with theatres and amphitheatres[4]; all these parties, and many more, whom it would be tedious to enumerate, would feel themselves interested in suppressing the Christians who were spoiling their several trades, denouncing the use of idols, emptying the temples, seceding from the processions, abstaining from public shows and spectacles.

Besides all these, the heretics helped to swell the cry against them[5]; and the Jews yet more, scattered as they were throughout all the nations and cities of the world, the bitterest persecutors of them all—another coincidence with the history of the Acts—none so active, we read, in fetching fuel from the manufactories and baths to burn Polycarp as they, *ὡς ἔθος αὐτοῖς*, says the circular epistle of the Church of Smyrna, which records this martyrdom.[6] So that on the whole, Irenæus, in expounding the 99th Psalm, "the Lord sitteth between the Cherubim, be the earth never so unquiet," may well speak of "the wrath of the people, vented against those who believed in Christ, and the movement of the whole earth against the Church" (motum universæ terræ adversus ecclesiam).[7]

[1] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. vii. c. viii.
[2] c. xi.
[3] c. xii.
[4] Apol. c. xxxviii. c. xlii.
[5] Cyprian, De Bono Patientiæ, § xxi.
[6] De Polycarpi Martyrio, § xiii.
[7] Irenæus, IV. c. xxxiii. § 13.

Taking all these circumstances, then, into account, I think we shall be disposed to consider the *extent* of the persecution of the early Church to have been very wide and wasting, even though it should not appear (which, however, may be doubted, for a great number of Apologies are in one instance nearly coincident in date, those by Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus, Melito, Apollinarius,[1] all in the reign of Aurelius) that any *simultaneous* movement against the Church took place throughout the empire so early as some suppose.

[1] Evans, Biography of the Early Church, vol. i. p. 153.

LECTURE V.

Testimony of the Fathers, 2°. To the *intensity* of the persecutions, unduly extenuated by Gibbon. Reflections on his account of the Letter of Pliny and of the martyrdom of Cyprian. Early narratives of martyrdom not to be confounded with the fictions of later times. The sources of information as reliable as those from which Gibbon drew his history. Explanation of a passage in Eusebius unfairly used by him. 3°. To the *nature* of the persecutions. Domestic as well as official ones foretold by Christ. Verification in the effect of Christianity on the relations of husband and wife, parent and child, master and servant. Its inconsistency with many trades and occupations. Consequent pecuniary losses to the converts. Their embarrassment in legal and commercial proceedings.

I HAVE said that the writings of the early Fathers would convince us, that not the *extent* only of the persecution suffered by the early Christians had been greatly underrated by Mr. Gibbon; but that the *intensity* of it had been unduly extenuated, and the *nature* of it but partially exposed.

The feeling with which he sat down to write on the subject of persecution may be incidentally discovered by the view he takes of Pliny's famous correspondence with Trajan. "The learned Mosheim," says he, "expresses himself with the highest approbation of Pliny's moderate and candid temper. Notwithstanding Dr. Lardner's suspicions, I am unable to discover any bigotry in his language or proceedings."[1] I have already admitted that Pliny's reluctance to execute the laws against the Christians to the uttermost, arose from a natural horror of condemning such multitudes of persons, many of them of a tender age, to death, upon so inadequate a charge. Let that measure of praise be conceded to him. But what can we think of an author who undertakes to give a candid representation of the affairs of these early Christians, and informs us at the outset that he is unable to discover any bigotry in the proceedings of Pliny—of Pliny who actually tells us with great composure that he had considered it necessary to put to the rack two

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 417, note.

female attendants of the Christians, probably Deaconesses, in order to ascertain the nature of their meetings; "necessarium credidi ex duabus ancillis, quæ ministræ dicebantur, quid esset veri, per *tormenta* quærere."[1] No wonder, therefore, that writing in this temper he should be found detailing the particulars of Cyprian's martyrdom in the manner he does; choosing that case, it should seem, for reasons which will appear, as a fair specimen of the treatment the martyrs in general received at the hands of their oppressors. "A short abstract of the most important circumstances" (of Cyprian's death), he writes, "will convey the clearest information of the spirit, and of the forms, of the Roman persecutions."[2] Now how does he treat this pattern case? Cyprian was banished; but, says he, it was to "a pleasant situation, a fertile territory" (apricum et competentem locum[3]). "He was recalled from banishment," but it was to "his own gardens" near Carthage that he was now confined. "The frailty of nature tempted him to withdraw himself by a secret flight from the danger and the honour of martyrdom," so proceeds Gibbon[4]: but why should Cyprian's own account of the transaction be suppressed, given in his 83rd Epistle, that he fled because agents had been sent to carry him to the Proconsul at Utica, whereas he preferred to die at Carthage, and suffer in the midst of his flock? for on the removal of that magistrate to Carthage, he voluntarily returned to his former quarters, and waited the event. He was summoned to die, but he was conducted by the ministers of death "not to a prison, but to a private house," and "an elegant supper was provided" for his entertainment; so Gibbon dresses up the phrase in Pontius' narrative, "unâ nocte continuit custodiâ delicatâ." Sentence was passed on him, but it was to be beheaded, "the mildest and least painful" manner of execution—only to be beheaded! no "use of torture admitted, to obtain from the Bishop of Carthage either the recantation of his principles, or the discovery of his accomplices;"[5] and yet that was the very thing that Gibbon could see no harm in Pliny's having recourse to. "His corpse remained during some hours exposed to the curiosity of the Gentiles;" but then it was removed "in a triumphal pro-

[1] Plinii Epist. lib. X. Ep. xcvii.
[2] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 430.
[3] Pontius, De Vitâ Cypriani, c. xii.
[4] p. 432.
[5] p. 433.

cession," the friends who had performed for him the last offices "secure from the danger of inquiry, or of punishment."[1] Another man might have thought of the agony of the martyr, or the tyranny of the martyrdom; Gibbon is occupied with the merits of the executioner. One remembers no parallel to this, but the well-known passage of Isaac Walton's Fisherman, so often quoted, because so often pertinent, who was to put the hook through the mouth of the live frog, and out at his gills, and with a fine needle and silk sew up the upper part of his leg with only one stitch to the arming wire of the hook, and in so doing, all the while to *use him as though he loved him.* I ask, is it possible for a man composing his history in a frame of mind such as this, to be capable of fairly stating the amount of suffering allotted to the martyrs, or to do justice to their terrible wrongs? There is, too, a little circumstance connected with Mr. Gibbon's mode of handling his authorities in this narrative, which I regard as characteristic. In this instance, he is very much more than commonly civil to the biographer of a martyr; such parties seldom finding much favour in his eyes; but the document happening to furnish him with points on which he could plausibly construct his pleasant picture of the martyrdom we have seen, it becomes his interest to exalt the merits of this piece of biography; and accordingly in a note he says, "We have an original Life of Cyprian by the Deacon Pontius, the companion of his exile, and the spectator of his death; and we likewise possess the ancient proconsular acts of his martyrdom. These two relations are consistent with each other, and with probability; and *what is somewhat remarkable, they are both unsullied by any miraculous circumstances.*"[2] And yet Pontius writes in this very same memoir, which supplies Gibbon with the particulars of these transactions in a manner so much to his mind, that "on the day of Cyprian's arrival at the place of his exile, there appeared to him, before he was yet asleep, a youth of more than common stature, who seemed to him to lead him to the hall of justice, and place him before the tribunal of the Proconsul. The Proconsul beheld him, and instantly, without asking him a question, began to make a note of his sentence. But the youth who stood at his back, with great curiosity, read what he had written down. And

[1] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 434. [2] p. 430, note.

when he could not declare in words what it was, he did so by a sign. For spreading his hand like a broadsword, he imitated the blow of the executioner; and so conveyed his meaning as clearly as if he had uttered it. Cyprian understood the sentence, and entreated for a respite, if but of one day, that he might set his affairs in order. And when he had repeated this petition many times, the Proconsul again began to write on his tablet: but what it was he knew not, but he conjectured from the calmness of the judge's countenance, that he had been moved by so reasonable a request. The youth, who had already informed him by a gesture of his sentence, speedily, but secretly, apprised him by a twist of his fingers, that the day's delay was granted."[1] "All that was thus predicted," adds Pontius, "came to pass; the words of the Deity were in no degree falsified; only the single day signified the single year which Cyprian was to live after the vision."[2] Now certainly there are many persons who would not see anything miraculous in this incident, anything which might not be accounted for naturally by the circumstances of the case. But supposing the life on the whole had not suited Gibbon's purpose so well as it did, and supposing that instead of relating the last scenes of Cyprian's career in the unimpassioned manner it does, it had painted the punishment of the martyr in the revolting colours it might have done with strict truth, can we believe that Mr. Gibbon, knowing what we do of him, would have suppressed all allusion to this vision, and even have gone out of his way to say of the biography, that "what was remarkable, it was unsullied by any miraculous circumstances"? Would he not have been the very man to make himself merry with it; to attempt, by means of it, to cast discredit on the whole history, by distorting what he would have called this supernatural part of it; and would he not have asked triumphantly, whether any authority could be assigned to such a manifest legend?

The vivid imaginations of the monks of the middle ages may have peopled the literature of that period with many fictitious scenes in the tragedies of martyrdom; and this fact may have given scoffers an advantage in misinterpreting the character of the earlier martyrologies, confounding all together. But those of the first three centuries are, for the

[1] Pontius, De Vitâ et Passione Cypriani, c. xii. [2] c. xiii.

most part, sober matter-of-fact narratives, and in general very brief ones. Eusebius has given a great many in a summary detail, such as the martyrdom of James, from Hegesippus[1]; of Simeon, from the same[2]; of Ignatius, from tradition,[3] of whom also we have a distinct Martyrology; of Polycarp, from the contemporary Epistle of the Church of Smyrna[4]; of Blandina, of Sanctus, of Attalus, of Pothinus, of Alexander and Maturus, from the contemporary Epistle of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne[5]; of Origen,[6] of Metras, of Quinta, of Apollonia, of Julian, of Epimachus, of Alexander, of Ammonarium, of Mercuria, of Dionysia, of Heron and Ater, of Dioscorus and Nemesion, and others by name, from Dionysius, a contemporary Bishop of Alexandria[7]; with many more which might be mentioned. But on looking them over, you will not find them in general disgraced by any fantastic fictions. The visions—for visions there are connected with the deaths of Ignatius and Polycarp, and perhaps others—are such as would be well accounted for by the circumstances of the cases, and certain unusual rather than marvellous events which attended some of these instances of martyrdom—such as the indisposition of the wild beasts to meddle with the culprit, or the agitation of the elements at the moment of his execution—might very well have happened, and been imputed by the excited bystanders to some providential sympathy with the victims. Possibly an incident in the death of Polycarp, however, may be thought to bear the aspect of a tale of these later times. The executioner stabbed him, and then ἐξῆλθε περιστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος ὥστε κατασβέσαι τὸ πῦρ, "there came forth a dove, and a rush of blood enough to extinguish the fire."[8] But no mention is made of this dove by Eusebius, who also gives the particulars of the history much as we have it in the Martyrology; nor does it seem to combine with the context. It is scarcely possible that the author of the account should not have added a word more on the subject of this strange event, but having said that a dove and some blood enough to extinguish the fire proceeded from the martyr, should have left us in this surprise just as if he

[1] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. ii. c. 23.
[2] iii. c. 32.
[3] c. 36.
[4] iv. c. 15.
[5] v. c. 1.
[6] vi. c. 39.
[7] c. 41.
[8] De Polycarpi Martyrio, c. xvi.

had been relating the most ordinary occurrence imaginable. It seems therefore, a very natural conjecture which has been suggested, that there is here an error in the reading, and that instead of ἐξῆλθε περιστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, κ.τ.λ., it should be ἐξῆλθεν ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ καὶ πλῆθος αἵματος, κ.τ.λ. "There issued out on the left side (the region of the heart) even so much blood as was enough to extinguish the fire." There is also, I will add, in Tertullian the record of a fact, which has been thought to be of the same character: that of the Apostle John having been cast by Domitian into a bath of hot oil, out of which he escaped unhurt[1]—an incident which rests upon his authority alone, though repeated by others after him. The truth of it has been called in question by modern critics, and possibly Tertullian may have admitted an occurrence of which the scene was neither in his own country nor in his own time without sufficient evidence, or as Mosheim[2] conjectures, he may have taken literally an account of some persecution which befell John, conveyed to him in the figurative language of the East. But at the same time we must remember, that with respect to all such events we have been long under the strong bias of a sceptical age—that our Lord certainly gave unto his disciples, John amongst the number (for it is not of any indifferent person that the story is told, but of one that we know of a certainty bore a charmed life), "power to tread on serpents and scorpions, and over all the power of the enemy"[3]; and that "if they drank any deadly thing, it should not hurt them"[4]; or, as it is more fully expressed by the other Evangelist, that "nothing should by any means hurt them," that is, until their hour was come, and they had fulfilled their mission, which John would not have done in the case before us, for he had his Revelation still to write; and that under this guarantee, as Papias tells us, Barsabas called Justus, having drunk a poison, sustained no harm from it[5]; and that certainly Paul was enabled to shake off the viper, one of the few incidents of this nature recorded of the Apostles in Holy Writ; and yet many similar ones we must suppose to have occurred in fulfilment of our Lord's

[1] Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxxvi.

[2] Mosheim, De Rebus Christian. ante Constant. p. 111.

[3] Luke x. 19.

[4] Mark xvi. 18.

[5] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 39; Routh. Rel. Sacr. vol. i. p. 12.

contemplations when he uttered the words I have cited; and this one of St. Paul, like the one in question of St. John, would certainly have been made matter of debate, had it been related by an early ecclesiastical historian, and omitted by an Evangelist.

But the statements of the sufferings of the early Christians, as I have already hinted, are far from being confined to the regular Martyrologies. They enter incidentally, but very largely, into almost all the writings of the early Fathers, the Apologies above all; and are derived from so many quarters, and relate to so many districts, that to set them aside would be an act purely arbitrary, and such as no materials for history whatever would be proof against. How can we feel ourselves justified in refusing to give credence to unvarnished accounts of suffering recorded in many instances by men who, as I have said before, show no disposition to aggravate them, but with the account of the persecution supply at the same time any circumstances of mitigation on the one side or of failure on the other, that attended it; any instances of the humanity of the magistrate as well as of the weakness of the victim? The greater part of the facts of Mr. Gibbon's history would not rest upon better testimony than the following ones, for all of which I have references: that in the early times of Christianity, the calumny which represented the Christians as guilty of infanticide and incestuous intercourse in their assemblies, had been so industriously circulated, and taken such effect, as to set multitudes against them; insomuch that even in Origen's day, when experience had abated it, there were some who would not even speak to Christians on the commonest subject from a horror of their character[1]; that the Christians were beheaded, crucified, cast to wild beasts, consigned to bonds and fire, and all other torments, and yet did not shrink from their confession[2]; that they were sometimes stoned by the populace[3]; that they were furiously driven by them from their houses, from the markets and baths, and were hunted whenever they appeared in public[4]; that they were

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, VI. § 27. Origen again speaks of the calumny as having been exploded in his time. Ὡς γὰρ ταῦτα λεγόμενα ἤδη καὶ ὑπὸ τῶν πολλῶν, καὶ πάντῃ ἀλλοτρίων τῆς καθ' ἡμῶν θεοσεβείας, καταγιγνώσκεται ὡς κατεψευσμένα Χριστιανῶν.— § 40.

[2] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 110.

[3] Tertullian, Apol. c. xlviii.; Theophilus, Ad Autol. III. § 30.

[4] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 1.

known by the nick-name of Sarmenticii, from the faggots or sarmenta with which they were burnt, and Semaxii, from the split axles which served for the stakes[1]—designations which would scarcely have been assigned to them had not the punishment they indicated been very familiar to the people; that "Down with the sepulchres of the Christians" was one of the war-cries of their oppressors[2]; that their women were condemned to defilement, in spite of Mr. Gibbon's insinuation that such imputations were the inventions of the monks and of a later age[3]; so that it was a matter of consolation in a season of unusual mortality, that the Christian virgins would thus depart to their glory, nor have before them the fear of threats of violation or of the brothel[4]; that the lash, the club, the flames,[5] the prison, the sword, the wild beast, the cross,[6] the chains, the rack, the hot metal plates,[7] the stocks,[8] are all spoken of as instruments of the torture of the Christians in a manner that shows they were ordinary and accustomed weapons used in this savage warfare; that women as well as men, whose names are given, for these things were not done in a corner, were submitted to these engines of pain and death; that they were branded by the hot plates of brass applied to the more sensitive parts of the person; left for a few days for their wounds to fester and inflame; tortured again; torn by the wild beasts in the amphitheatre; tossed in nets by furious bulls; fried in an iron chair; in some instances the same individual made to pass through a series of these sufferings, if life lasted; and these matters, too, brought to our knowledge, not by Christians writing in indignation to heathens, but in confidence to Christians; contemporaries not talking at second-hand, but speaking of events which they had witnessed with their own eyes.[9] Again, that others (and here, once more, in the instance I am alluding to, we have the names of several of the sufferers recorded) died of starvation in prison[10]; and that ordinary pains not sufficing to glut the vengeance of the persecutors, methods were devised for protracting the pangs of their victims, and tedious tortures applied

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. l.
[2] Ad Scapulam, c. iii.
[3] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 424; Tertullian, Apol. c. l.
[4] Cyprian, De Mortalitate, § xv.
[5] De Lapsis, § xii.
[6] De Bono Patientiæ, § xii.
[7] De Laude Martyrii, § xv.
[8] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. l.
[9] Ibid.
[10] Cyprian, Ep. xxi.

to the body by a refinement of cruelty[1]: not to speak of excesses, if possible, even greater than these, which are described in the twelfth chapter of the eighth book of the history of Eusebius, to which I must refer you; and the effect of which even Mr. Gibbon seems to have felt to be so staggering, that he endeavours to destroy the authority of the historian on this subject by a disingenuous note, as though he had confessed that in his narrative he was governed by the principle of relating whatever would redound to the glory, and suppressing all that would be to the disgrace of religion[2]—a version of his confession which the references Gibbon gives to passages in that writer's works are far from supporting. For what does the confession amount to? That he will not be instrumental to publishing the weakness of those who shrunk from the trial and fell away, but will act the better and more profitable part of preserving the memory of the confessors of the truth that stood fast[3]; in other words, that it is his plan to give a catalogue of martyrs, not of apostates. Where is the duplicity? There was no absolute call on him here to state that apostates there were; and the statement should be taken rather as an argument of the candour and veracity of the historian than of his partial dealing and suppression of testimony.

But there is another view of persecution, which Mr. Gibbon overlooks, but which is one of the most serious of all, and in reference to which it was that I said the *nature* of the persecution which the early Christians suffered was very partially set forth by that writer; nor, indeed, is it sufficiently developed by authors in general, who treat of these times of trouble. And yet it is the one, which the words of our blessed Lord point to and anticipate. He does not simply tell his followers that people "shall lay their hands on them and persecute them, delivering them up to the synagogues and into prisons, and bringing them before kings and rulers for his name's sake;"[4] it shall not be simply *official* persecution, which they shall have to endure, but *domestic*. "I came not to send peace," says he, "but a sword. For I am come to set a man at variance against his father, and the daughter against her mother, and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-

[1] Ad Demetrianum, § xii.
[2] Gibbon, vol. ii. p. 490, note 178.
[3] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. viii. c. 2.
[4] Luke xxi. 12.

law. And a man's foes shall be they of his own household."[1] A great deal of what we read in the early Fathers, is but a comment on these words. And though, no doubt, the public and legal, or the popular persecution to which the primitive Christians were subjected, was the form of it which makes the impression in history; still probably that which was far more felt, and which was far more extensive in its influence was the *fireside* troubles, which the profession of the Christian faith fostered. I touched upon some of these in a Lecture of my last Course, when I was defending the Fathers against the animadversions of Barbeyrac; but I did not then exhaust the subject, nor indeed had I then to contemplate it from quite the same position as at present. Thus the Christian member of a family otherwise heathen (and this sort of intermixture was of course the most ordinary and usual of combinations), was constantly living in a state of uneasiness and discomfort. Sympathy with his nearest kindred would be greatly weakened by the enormous difference in their respective feelings, and in their notions of right and wrong; and even his personal safety would be constantly in jeopardy. Suppose a wife to have an unbelieving husband, his crimes might revolt her and lead her to seek a divorce; but he has her at his mercy, for he can denounce her as a Christian[2]: in the meanwhile there is not a religious exercise which she may desire to discharge, in which he cannot thwart her[3]; not an offensive heathen practice, sight, or sound, to which he may not expose her.[4] Nor is this all; so utterly odious was Christianity in the eyes of some of these husbands, that they could not bear to have a Christian under the same roof with them, and would put away their wives for this cause, when their chastity was above all suspicion[5]: nay more, husbands who in time past had watched their wives with the utmost jealousy, on finding them become sober and domestic, and discovering that the cause of their change was their conversion to the Christian faith, putting away all their former feelings, would now give them every opportunity of licence and excess, preferring to have for their partners those who were prostitutes rather than those who were Christians.[6] On the other hand, does the

[1] Matt. x. 34, 35, 36.
[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. II. § 2.
[3] Tertullian, Ad Uxorem, II. c. iv.
[4] c. vi.
[5] Tertullian, Apol. c. iii.
[6] Ad Nationes, I. § 4.

wife endeavour to conceal her faith from her heathen husband, the concealment is itself an intolerable restraint; nor can it be done effectually; and the very attempt excites his jealousy and suspicion. What can she mean by crossing herself? Why does she rise from her sleep to pray? Is she engaged in some magical craft? What can that bread be which she eats with so much reverence? Can it be what she says it is? But he will keep his own counsel till occasion may serve, and she may provoke him to produce the weapons, with which she has armed him.[1] I am not putting imaginary cases, as you will perceive by the nature of the details I have given; but such cases as the Fathers supply us with. How much fortitude, how much self-restraint, how much patient tribulation, how much suffering, in short, for righteousness' sake, would be required of her who should realise the following deportment recommended by Clemens probably in anticipation of a case of unequal yoke-fellowship! "Scripture very well says that the woman is given by God to the man as a helpmeet for him. It is plain, therefore, I conceive, that if anything falls out amiss from her husband in her household, she will adjust it by reason and persuasion: but if he will not listen to her, then she will endeavour, so far as human nature is capable of it, to lead a life void of offence, whether it be required of her by the Word (or reason) to die or to live; knowing that she has God for her ally and partner in such a course of conduct, a real Champion and Saviour both for the present and the future."[2] And again, where other relations are contemplated as well as that of husband and wife, "Often do we see sons and wives and servants, even in spite of fathers and masters and husbands, become of the number of the best of persons (*i. e.* Christians). It is not the less a duty, therefore, to be zealous to lead godly lives, because some may seem to forbid it. But in my opinion, it becomes us to strive the more with all zeal and alacrity that we may not be overcome, and fall away from those counsels, which are the best and most needful of all."[3] These are simple words, but what disruption of family ties do they imply! This distress had begun to show itself even in the Apostles' time, as, indeed, had most of the other difficulties, which

[1] Ad Uxorem, II. c. v.
[2] Clem. Alex. Stromat. IV. § xx. p. 622.
[3] Clem. Alex. Stromat. IV. § viii. p. 594.

attended the intimate social connection of Christians and heathens; and most of the seventh chapter of St. Paul's first epistle to the Corinthians relates to it. The position of parent and child, when the parties differed in faith, a case which is also alluded to in the passage of Clemens just cited, is full of similar embarrassments. Thus to go for a moment into details; we are told of the father abandoning his son, who had been to him the most dutiful of children, on becoming aware that he was turned Christian[1]: or even for the like reason disinheriting him at the very moment when his conduct was no longer (as it had been formerly) a cause for complaint.[2] The relation of master and servant under the circumstances also touched on in the same paragraph of Clemens is encompassed with the like perplexities. The slave or domestic servant, supposing him to be a heathen, could not be the inmate of his Christian master's house, without becoming aware of his master's faith more or less distinctly; whilst the latter must have felt that he had a spy under his own roof, and that he had to act accordingly. What a perpetual source of apprehension and solicitude must this have proved! How must this single ingredient have poisoned the security of home! The sentiments of distrust engendered by it transpire in several places in the early Fathers. "We have servants," says Athenagoras, in defending the Christians against the horrid accusations of incest and cannibalism laid to their charge, "we have servants; how can we conceal such things from them? Yet none of them have testified against us to anything of the sort"[3]; as though the Christians considered themselves even in their greatest privacy to be under inspection. And Tertullian, when challenging the same testimony on the same occasion, "Could not the curiosity of our servants steal a peep at us through chinks and holes?"[4] And again, in language still more calculated to impress us with the precarious situation in which Christian masters felt themselves standing, who had heathen servants, "The date of our religion, as we have shown, is from the time of Tiberius. From its very first appearance the truth was opposed through that hatred which always exists towards truth. There were as many enemies

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. iii.
[2] Ad Nationes, I. § 4.
[3] Athenagoras, Legat. pro Christianis, § 35, Paris Ed.
[4] Tertullian, Ad Nationes, I. § vii.

to it as there were strangers; the Jews peculiarly out of jealousy; the soldiers, out of a spirit of extortion; even our very servants, out of that nature which belongs to their condition. We are daily beset, we are daily betrayed."[1] And we in fact find that the servants of the Christians at Lyons under apprehension of the torture did pretend to disclose the secret habits of their Christian masters, and uttered unfounded calumnies against them which brought them to their deaths[2]: nay, perhaps, they really themselves misunderstood much that they saw and heard, and honestly thought there was mischief in what was at any rate mysterious,[3] as *e. g.* a Thyestean feast in the spiritual participation of the Body and Blood of Christ. But even when matters did not proceed to extremities after this manner, the relation of master and servant must have been almost reversed, when the latter felt that the law gave him a hold over the other, which whenever it suited his purpose he could turn to account. Or take it the other way, and let the servant be a Christian; and now the master who has been ever humane to him in time past, and who probably for that reason will not proceed further against him still, will nevertheless drive him from his sight, however faithful he has been to him; the abhorrence of the Christian prevailing over every sense he may have of the virtues of the man.[4] Or, if he has had the good fortune to conceal his profession from his master's knowledge, then he will have perhaps to attend him to the temple and the sacrifice. What is he to do in that case; and how is he to act, so as to have a conscience void of offence? I do not invent these difficulties.[5] They are facts left on record.

Neither is this all. There is another trouble which pressed hard upon the early Christians, scarcely, perhaps, coming under the head of persecution, but still akin to it; and as constituting one of the fines which the Christians had to pay for their calling, one of the hardships they had to endure for the profession they had made, may be here conveniently considered: for, like positive persecution, it was calculated to try the faith to the uttermost; to shake it where it was wavering; and to minister to the Evidences by showing how sound

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. vii.
[2] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 1.
[3] Irenæus, Fragm. xiii. p. 343, Bened. Ed.
[4] Tertullian, Apol. c. iii.
[5] De Idololatriâ, c. xvii.

the early Christians must have felt the ground to be under them, in order to be induced to submit to such penalties as they did for the purpose of maintaining it. I mean the pecuniary losses, the absolute poverty, the dislocation in society, the interruption of the old habits of life, which the profession of Christianity often exacted of the converts as a deodand. We have seen that one effect of it was to induce fathers sometimes to disinherit their children; but the evil I speak of was not confined to this form of it. There were many trades and occupations, the exercise of which was scarcely compatible with the Christian calling; so that the conversion to Christianity entailed on a convert belonging to those classes many scruples of conscience and much trouble of mind, if he continued in his craft; whilst, on the other hand, the resignation of it was the surrender of that by which he altogether gained his bread. For idolatry had wormed itself so thoroughly into the system of life, that there might be many such trades. We have seen in the passage I have already had occasion to refer to, that a certain Christian who was a player, was not permitted to communicate; and that, by consequence, it was proposed to make him a frugal allowance, a bare maintenance out of the fund of the Church, to secure him at least from starvation, whilst he followed the dictates of his conscience.[1] This case must have, no doubt, been a common one. How many statuaries, for instance, must have felt it impossible to reconcile their employment of making idols with their allegiance to Christ, and yet the abandonment of such a calling proved so costly, that some even in ecclesiastical orders, Deacons probably or of lower rank, could not find in their hearts to give it up[2]! The seller of incense must have been as common a trade as the tobacconist now is, he had a designation of his own, "Turarius;" yet how would he reconcile it to himself to minister to the worship of idols, for the article he dealt in was bought for scarcely any other purpose[3]? What a trying situation, again, was that of the schoolmaster; to read with his scholars works of mythology, *i. e.* of idolatry still flourishing; to keep heathen holidays: the Minervalia in honour of Minerva, the Saturnalia in honour of Saturn; to decorate his school with garlands in honour of Flora[4]; for to

[1] Cyprian, Ep. lxi.
[2] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. vii.
[3] c. xi.
[4] c. x.

renounce all this would be to ruin his school and proclaim himself a Christian! What an intolerable compunction must the Christian soldier have felt at mounting guard on a heathen temple, a mere brothel, let to the highest bidder, as our turnpike gates, or, indeed, at making one of a camp, where signa venerari, signa jurare, signa omnibus diis præponere erat tota religio.[1] Yet what an act of self-surrender was it to leave the profession of arms! Eusebius thinks it matter for high commendation that Christian soldiers under Diocletian suffered themselves to be turned out of the army rather than renounce their religion, and represents their station as very honourable and very lucrative.[2] It would be easy to pursue this subject still further into its details, but these I have given may suffice to put my hearers on following them out for themselves: and are enough, I am sure, to satisfy them that the secret and unobtrusive sacrifices which the early Christians must have been called on to make for the sake of holding fast their faith, were, perhaps, the most trying, as they were certainly the most universal of all. Indeed, the self-denial they required is acknowledged by Tertullian, who supplied me with the facts[3]; and who argues in the uncompromising manner, which is usual with him, that the cost to be sure is great, but that it ought to have been counted before the Christian profession was embraced; that the cross was to be borne by the followers of the crucified; that James and John forsook their calling for the Lord's service; and that a sound faith has no fear of lacking bread. But all this is more easily said than reduced to practice.

I have already observed that these troubles do not directly fall under the head of persecution; but they do fall under the head of sufferance inflicted on the Christians by circumstances, if not by magistrates or mobs; and besides developing the condition of the Primitive Church, which is an object I have before me, redound to the Evidences (which is the topic I am now handling, and showing how the Fathers furnish a valuable contingent to it) by manifesting yet more, how entire must have been the conviction of the early Christians of the truth of the religion they had adopted, to have induced them, as it did, to submit to trials so many, so various,

[1] Apol. c. xvi.
[2] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. viii. c. 4.
[3] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xii.

and so protracted. Perhaps it scarcely adds to the portrait of the rigour of the position of the Christians to remark how effectually all the avenues to advancement in the state were closed, and particularly how completely the discharge of all judicial and magisterial functions was interdicted to them by the idolatrous rites with which they were attended, and at which it was impossible that the Christians could connive. But as I dwelt at some length on this part of the subject in a former Lecture,[1] I shall be content with merely hinting at this further tax which they had to pay for the faith they had followed.

There is, however, one consideration more, which it behoves us to bear in mind, as affecting most disastrously, and in a very high degree, the nearest and dearest interests of the Christian, the little use he could make of the courts of law, as well for other reasons as because the heathen oaths there administered were effectual obstacles in his way.[2] He was, in fact, virtually an outlaw; one with respect to whom the paternal influence of the law was suspended; and this distressing position, we must remember, he chose to place himself in for the sake of Christ. This difficulty again, like so many others, discovered itself whilst the Apostles were yet living. "Dare any of you, having a matter against another, go to law before the unjust, and not before the saints?"[3] "Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? no, not one that shall be able to judge between his brethren? But brother goeth to law with brother, and that before the unbelievers."[4] It is the ingenious and very probable conjecture of Professor Dobree, that the incestuous union mentioned in the chapter before that in which this passage occurs, had given rise to some question of property, and that thus is supplied the connection between the two subjects, otherwise apparently incongruous. This, too, would further account for St. Paul's impassioned animadversions on this matter, a matter which was so well calculated, when carried before a heathen tribunal, to bring a scandal on the Christian cause. Similar difficulties were, no doubt, perpetually arising in the Church in subsequent times, the more likely indeed, as the social relations of the Christians became more complicated. And

[1] The XIth of the former Series.
[2] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xvii.
[3] 1 Cor. vi. 1.
[4] vv. 5, 6.

when we take into account that whatever decisions, whether in civil or criminal cases, were come to by Christians amongst themselves, were after all merely private agreements, having no force of law, nor capable of being pressed, should either party swerve from the award, we may well imagine how much this must have contributed to the hardships under which the early Christians laboured; whilst the reluctance thus felt to go before heathen tribunals, or to be contaminated by heathen forms, must have perpetually stood in the way of advantageous contracts which Christians might otherwise have made with heathens (who would of course naturally insist on their own securities), precluding them, for instance, from executing bonds as creditors (the case is put by Tertullian himself [1]), and so rescuing themselves from embarrassments which the extension of credit often removes; and, indeed, intercepting in a very great measure the mutual advantages which result from the free intercourse of man with man, to the damage of both, but to the ruin of what the Christian probably was, the poorer party.

[1] Tertullian, De Idololatriâ, c. xxiii.

LECTURE VI.

Review of passages in the early Fathers bearing witness to the exercise of *miraculous powers* in their times. Unanimity of this testimony. Estimate, which ought to be formed of it; and difficulty of resisting it. The powers of exorcism and healing diseases more decidedly asserted than others. Correspondence of this with the terms in which the powers were conferred, and with the record of their exercise in the Acts. The same correspondence between the Scriptural and Ecclesiastical records observable in another particular. The exercise of miraculous powers by those on whom the Apostles laid their hands established by inspired authority. The theory of the cessation of all miracles with their lives unsatisfactory.

THE next point we have to consider, in which the Fathers may be made instrumental to the Evidences, is one of great difficulty and perplexity; the *miraculous powers* which subsisted in the Primitive Church.

I shall review as briefly as possible some of the principal passages in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, which bear on this subject, and endeavour to draw a conclusion from an induction of particulars.

It has been disputed whether the Apostolical Fathers, properly so called, speak of contemporary miracles at all. Considering how short are their works, and the practical purpose for which most of them are written, the absence of all allusion to miracles in them would prove little or nothing, and might well be accidental. Such an expression, however, as that of Clemens Romanus,[1] that there was in the Church of Corinth "a plentiful outpouring of the Holy Ghost upon all" (πλήρης Πνεύματος Ἁγίου ἔκχυσις ἐπὶ πάντας ἐγίνετο,) or that of Ignatius addressed to the Church of Smyrna, "that it was mercifully blessed with every good gift" (ἐν παντὶ χαρίσματι,) "that it was wanting in no good gift," (ἀνυστέρητος οὖσα παντὸς χαρίσματος)[2]—such phraseology, I say, being compared with that of times both before and

[1] Ad Corinthios, I. § ii.

[2] Salutation of the Epistle of Ignatius to the Church of Smyrna.

after, when it undoubtedly had miraculous as well as other gifts in contemplation, would lead us to think, I agree with Dodwell,[1] that Clemens and Ignatius did not exclude such gifts from their account.

Justin Martyr's testimony is not to be mistaken. He challenges a denial of the fact. "It is manifest to all" (*πᾶσι φανερόν ἐστι*), says he, "that the Father has given Christ so much power, that even the demons are subject to the dispensation of his Passion."[2] "That Jesus was born for those who believe in him, and for the overthrow of devils, you may learn," says he again, "from the things which even now (*καὶ νῦν*) are coming to pass under your own eyes. For many of our people (*i. e.* Christians) having adjured by the name of Jesus Christ, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, many persons possessed with devils (*δαιμονιολήπτους*) all over the world and in *your city*, have healed them when they had not been healed by all other exorcists and enchanters and magicians, reducing and expelling the demons that had possession of the men."[3] And again, "and now (*καὶ νῦν*) we who believe in Jesus our Lord who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, when we adjure all devils and evil spirits, have them obedient to us."[4] Exorcism, you see, is the gift which he attributes to the Christians. In one passage, however, of the Dialogue,[5] he ascribes to them *προφητικὰ χαρίσματα* in general, as if they had been transferred to the Christians from the Jews, who once possessed but had since lost them. And in another of the same treatise,[6] he enumerates *healing* and *foreknowledge* amongst their supernatural endowments.

Here is one witness, now writing at Rome, now at Ephesus or elsewhere,[7] who testifies to the existence of certain miraculous powers in the Church, of *exorcism* more especially; which latter faculty he speaks of in a manner which must convince us that he thought the fact indisputable, however reluctant the parties he addressed might be to draw from it the conclusion he pressed. And yet Justin

[1] Dodwell, Dissert. in Irenæum, II. § vii.
[2] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 30.
[3] Apol. II. § 6.
[4] Dial. § 76.
[5] § 82.
[6] § 39.
[7] The Dialogue, however, though held, it is said, at Ephesus, does not appear to have been committed to writing for publication till some time afterwards.

was a man of education; had been a philosopher; and was writing in two of the tracts where these statements are made, to philosophical Emperors, and to the people of Rome; and was sufficiently a lover of truth to die for it.

Irenæus expresses himself to the same effect. Speaking of the heretics, he says, "they cannot give sight to the blind, nor hearing to the deaf, nor can they cast out evil spirits, except such as they have themselves introduced, if even that; nor heal the sick, the lame, the palsied; nor remove diseases which may happen to afflict any other part of the body. And *so far are they from raising the dead, as the Lord did and his Apostles, by prayer, and as hath come to pass often among the brethren, when the spirit of the dead hath returned, and the man been restored to the prayers of the saints*, the whole Church of the place on the necessary occasion entreating for him with much fasting and supplication—so far have they been from doing this, that they do not even believe that it can be done."[1] And again, having vindicated the miracles of our Lord from the charge of being ocular deceptions, he proceeds, "Wherefore his true disciples receiving grace from him, work benefits in his name for mankind, according to the gifts which each of them have received from him. For some *really and truly* eject evil spirits, so that those very persons who have been possessed, now purged of these demons, become believers, and are added to the Church. Others have *foreknowledge* of future events, see *visions*, and *prophesy*. Others, again, *heal the sick* by imposition of hands, and restore them to health; nay, as we have said, even the *dead have been raised up*, and continued with us many years."[2] And he elsewhere assigns to the Jews also the power of exorcism, on the principle that all created beings are afraid of an appeal to Him who created them. Again, with respect to the gift of tongues and the discerning of spirits, he writes, "as we have heard even many brethren in the Church possessing prophetical gifts, and speaking by the Spirit in all manner of tongues, and bringing to light advantageously the secrets of men."[3]

Here we have another witness, him also a man of education and research, and though perhaps not a martyr to the

[1] Irenæus, II. c. xxxi. § 2.
[2] c. xxxii. § 4.
[3] V. c. vi. § 1.

death, a man who, for the sake of teaching the truth, was content to forego the charms of his native land, and migrate to a distant, a barbarous, and as it proved a dangerous station; we have this man, I say, still testifying, in another quarter of the world too, in Gaul, to the existence of miraculous powers in the Church; exorcism; healing both of natural infirmities and sickness; prophecy; tongues; discerning of spirits; and even raising the dead: but perhaps expressing himself with different degrees of confidence whilst treating of these several gifts. Thus, with respect to exorcism, "some really and truly eject evil spirits" (*οἱ μὲν γὰρ δαίμονας ἐλαύνουσι βεβαίως καὶ ἀληθῶς*), is his language—"we have *heard* brethren speak with tongues, and detect spirits," so I understand *καθὼς καὶ πολλῶν ἀκούομεν ἀδελφῶν ἐν τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ προφητικὰ χαρίσματα ἐχόντων, καὶ παντοδαπαῖς λαλούντων διὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος γλώσσαις, καὶ τὰ κρύφια τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς φανερὸν ἀγόντων ἐπὶ τῷ συμφέροντι.* And in these instances, as well as in some others which I have named, he uses the present tense, *δαίμονας ἐλαύνουσι, πρόγνωσιν ἔχουσι, τοὺς κάμνοντας ἰῶνται, χαρίσματα ἐχόντων, παντοδαπαῖς γλώσσαις λαλούντων, τὰ κρύφια τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς φανερὸν ἀγόντων.* But when the miracle of raising the dead is touched on, the expressions are less definite, sæpe evenit fieri, *πολλάκις*, the phrase indefinite as to time—*ὁ Κύριος, οἱ ἀπόστολοι, ἡ πᾶσα ἐκκλησία*, the language again indefinite as to agents—So the tense in these cases is no longer the present, but the aorist, *τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ τετελευτηκότος ἐπέστρεψε*, the spirit of the dead returned—*ἐχαρίσθη*, he was granted to the prayers of the saints—*νεκροὶ ἠγέρθησαν καὶ παρέμειναν σὺν ἡμῖν*, the dead have been raised up, and have continued with us. There is something remarkable, at least, in the change of tense, something which, when coupled with the looser construction of the sentences, would lead us to think that though Irenæus had no doubt of the fact of the resurrection of the dead having been effected by the brethren, he had not witnessed a case with his own eyes.

Papias, a Bishop of Hierapolis of the second century, has left it on record, through Eusebius, who has preserved his testimony,[1] that he had received it from the daughters of Philip the Apostle, that one was raised from the dead in

[1] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 39; Routh. Reliq. Sacr. vol. i. p. 12.

Philip's time[1]; by whom, or in what place, is not specified, though we might suppose that Hierapolis was the scene: but the manner in which it is mentioned by Papias, would lead to the conclusion that even in his day, and he was a hearer of John, that particular miracle, though wrought, was rare. But here we have a witness to miracles in another part of the world, Asia Minor.

Theophilus, he too of the second century, a man of learning, a Bishop, and still in another region, Antioch, affirms the same fact, and much in the same way as the last two. He introduces his correspondent Autolycus saying, "Show me a man who has been raised from the dead, and I will believe;" to which challenge Theophilus replies, "Much thanks to you for such a belief, and yet you believe in Hercules and Æsculapius coming to life again. Perhaps I shall even show you a dead man raised and living, and yet you will not believe this."[2] We must remember that the challenge, put into the mouth of Autolycus, is in fact introduced to the reader by Theophilus himself; who would not, we may suppose, have volunteered it, had he felt the question to be a staggering one. The fair inference from his words seems to be, that he, like Papias and Irenæus, made no doubt of instances of resurrection from the dead having occurred, though he had none to give of his own experience.

Tertullian is another witness to the existence of miraculous powers in the Primitive Church in his own time, and still in a district far removed from any we have yet referred to, Carthage and its neighbourhood. His testimony is given with the same confidence as to some of the miracles, and the same reserve as to others, which we have already discovered in other of the Fathers. In his Apology addressed to the governors of proconsular Africa, persons of intelligence, therefore, and not to be duped by a bold claim laid by Christians to faculties which they did not in reality enjoy; writing, I say, to such men as these, Tertullian uses language like the following. "Let any one who is confessedly under the influence of demoniacal possession, be brought here before your

[1] So I construe *κατ' αὐτὸν* with Dodwell, Præf. Dissert. in Irenæum, § 8. *Νεκροῦ γὰρ ἀνάστασιν κατ' αὐτὸν γεγονυῖαν ἱστορεῖ.*

[2] *Ἴσως καὶ ἐπιδείξω σοι νεκρὸν ἐγερθέντα, καὶ ζῶντα, καὶ τοῦτο ἀπιστήσεις.* —Theophilus Ad. Autolycum, I. § 13.

tribunal. If the spirit be commanded by any Christian to speak, he shall as truly confess himself to be a demon as in other places he falsely professes himself to be a god;"[1] with much more to the same purpose. There may be some extravagance or incaution in the mere wording of the passage, but it is impossible not to believe that Tertullian considered he was perfectly safe in the challenge; and that his substantial meaning was, that exorcism was practised so successfully by Christians, that the result could not be denied by heathens. Again, in his "De Exhortatione Castitatis,"[2] whilst describing the advantages which accrue from the exercise of the virtue of chastity, he says, "Then if a man prays, he finds himself near heaven; if he applies himself to the Scriptures, he is wholly intent on them; if he *adjures a devil*, he has confidence in himself (si dæmonem adjurat, confidit sibi)." There is something in the very natural and casual way in which he here mentions exorcism, that gives one the utmost reliance in his own belief at least in the possession of that virtue by the Church. The same may be said of another passage in the De Idololatriâ, "Can he (*i. e.* he whose trade ministers to idolatry) *exorcise with any degree of consistency*, when he is the very man, who has been feeding these evil spirits, whom he evokes? If he casts out a devil, let him not flatter himself that it is effected by his faith."[3] The same of a third in the "De Spectaculis,"[4] "Want we pleasure (which those are in pursuit of who frequent these spectacles), what higher pleasure than the contempt of pleasure? the spurning of the world? true liberty? a clear conscience? a contented life? no fear of death? to trample upon the gods of the nations? to expel demons? to work cures? to seek revelations? to live to God? These are the spectacles of Christians." Again, Tertullian speaks without any hesitation on the subject of visions; "I *know* that one of the brethren," says he "was grievously chastised by a vision the same night that the slaves had decorated his house with garlands . . . . . yet he had not ordered it to be done;"[5] as though the party had himself informed him of the fact. And again, "There is at this

[1] Tertullian, Apol. c. xxiii.
[2] De Exhortatione Castitatis, c. x.
[3] De Idololatriâ, c. xi.
[4] Quod dæmonia expellis? quod medicinas facis? quod revelationes petis?—De Spectaculis, c. xxix.
[5] Scio fratrem per visionem eâdem nocte castigatum graviter, &c.—De Idololatriâ, c. xv.

day amongst us a sister who is endowed with the gift of revelations. These she experiences by ecstacy in the spirit at church amidst the solemnities of the Lord's day."[1] And then follows an account of her having seen a disembodied soul in one of these trances; the woman, no doubt, having herself related the incident. Again, in a still more remarkable passage, if I understand it right, "Nebuchadnezzar dreamed a dream from God, and almost the greater part of mankind get a knowledge of God through visions;"[2] as though the Spirit of God was very active in those days in producing an impression on the world through this channel. He, too, speaks of the miracle of raising the dead, but in terms which lead us to think that he knew of no case since the Apostles' time. Having argued that demons cannot evoke the spirits of the dead, but must have counterfeited them when they seemed to do so; and that the case of the rich man and Lazarus shows that the spirits of the dead cannot visit the earth, he proceeds, "besides, in the instances of the resurrection, when the power of God by the Prophets, or by Christ, or by the Apostles, restored souls to their bodies, it was done according to such substantial, palpable, satisfactory truth, as decided that such ought to be the form that truth on such occasions should take; and that whenever any exhibition of the dead, of an incorporeal nature was pretended, it was to be regarded as a fraud."[3] Here, we see, he makes the agents of these resurrections the Prophets, Christ, and his Apostles; but no others.

It is evident that Tertullian, like several of these authors before him, is not indiscriminate in his assertion of miraculous powers in the Church, but that whilst he is positive with respect to some, with respect to others he is cautious.

The only passage, says Bishop Kaye,[4] which he had found in the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, that has any bearing on the question of the evidence of miraculous powers in the Church, is in the extracts from the writings of Theodotus,[5] if that epitome be justly ascribed to him—"The Valentinians

[1] De Animâ, c. ix.

[2] Nabuchodonosor divinitus somniat: et major pene vis hominum ex visionibus Deum discunt.—c. xlvii.

[3] c. lvii.

[4] Bishop Kaye on the Writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, p. 468.

[5] Excerpta ex scriptis Theodoti et doctrinâ orientali.—§ xxiv. p. 975, Potter's Ed. of Clemens. This Theodotus was probably a Valentinian, anterior in date to Clemens.

say that the Spirit which each of the Prophets specially possessed for the purposes of his ministry, was poured forth on all the members of the Church. Hence the signs of the Spirit, cures of diseases and prophecies, are accomplished through the Church." Clemens' comment then is (supposing this work to be his), "they are ignorant that the Paraclete, who *now works proximately in the Church*, is of the same essence and power with him who worked proximately under the Old Testament."

There is, however, a paragraph in an undisputed writing of Clemens, the Stromata, which may be considered, I think, to have some relation to this question. "The proof that our Saviour is the very Son of God is this—the prophecies preceding his advent, and proclaiming him; the testimonies concerning him, accompanying his sensible birth; and *his powers preached and openly shown after his ascension*"[1]—miracles subsequent to his ascension certainly affirmed, but nothing determined as to how long subsequent, or whether active even at that time. Whatever this testimony may amount to, it is that of a very learned and inquisitive man, and is drawn from yet another district of Christendom, Alexandria.

Minucius Felix, a layman and a lawyer, and a dweller at Rome, challenges in the same uncompromising language as we have seen so many before him employ, any denial of the notorious fact that the Christians had the power of exorcism[2]; "Saturn and Serapis and Jupiter, and whatever other demon ye worship, subdued by pain, declare what they are, and cannot be supposed to tell lies to their own discredit, *especially when many of you are standing by.* Believing them to be demons on their own testimony, for when adjured by the true, the very God, they reluctantly tremble in the bodies they possess, and come out, either forthwith or by degrees, according to the faith of the sufferer or the grace of the healer."

Origen, whether we regard his evidence as that of an inhabitant of Egypt, of Palestine, of Cappadocia, of Nicomedia, of Athens, or of Arabia, for during the course of his unsettled life he appears to have been a sojourner in all these countries,

[1] Πρὸς δὲ καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν κηρυσσόμεναί τε καὶ ἐμφανῶς δεικνύμεναι δυνάμεις αὐτοῦ. — Clem. Alex. Stromat. VI. § xv. p. 801.

[2] Minucius Felix, Octav. c. xxvii.

furnishes evidence to the same effect as before—indeed, much more copiously than any other of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, and in terms so moderate and unimpassioned as to entitle it to the greater attention. Thus, in his treatise against Celsus, he speaks of the spirit of Christianity being demonstrated by prophecies, and "its power by those miraculous powers which we may show to exist both by many other arguments, and by the *traces of them* being yet preserved amongst those who lived according to the preaching of the Gospel."[1] And again, in the same treatise, in the same remarkable phrase, he objects to the Jews, that "There is no longer any sign of Divinity being amongst them, for that there are no longer prophets nor miracles, of which the *traces, at least,* are in some sort found amongst Christians, and *even more than the traces;* and if we are to be believed who say so," he adds, "we have ourselves seen them."[2] And again, "The signs of the Holy Ghost were displayed at the beginning of the preaching of Jesus; after his assumption, more; afterwards, fewer; though even now there are traces of it with a few persons who have their souls purged by reason (or the Word) and by behaviour according to it."[3] And again,[4] "And still traces (ἴχνη) of that Holy Spirit, which was seen in the form of a dove, are retained (σώζεται) amongst Christians. They eject demons, they perform cures, and they enjoy some visions of things future, according to the will of the Word. And though Celsus, or the Jew whom he introduces, may laugh at what I shall say, nevertheless it shall be spoken, because many, as it were, against their will have come over to Christianity, a certain spirit suddenly turning their minds from hating the word to being ready to die for it, and presenting them with the phantasm of a vision or dream. For we have ascertained many such things, which if we should write down, though ourselves having been present with them and seen them, we should afford matter of derision to un-

[1] Ἐκ τοῦ ἴχνη δὲ αὐτῶν ἔτι σώζεσθαι παρὰ τοῖς κατὰ τὸ βούλημα τοῦ λόγου βιοῦσι.—Origen, Contra Celsum, I. § 2.

[2] Ὧν κἂν ἴχνη ἐπὶ ποσὸν παρὰ Χριστιανοῖς εὑρίσκεται, καί τινά γε μείζονα, καὶ εἰ πιστοί ἐσμεν λέγοντες ἑωράκαμεν καὶ ἡμεῖς.—Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 8. The Benedictine editor would translate μείζονα "majora quam olim apud Judæos." See the index to that edition, p. 971, "Miracula."

[3] Ὕστερον δὲ ἐλάττονα· πλὴν καὶ νῦν ἔτι ἴχνη ἐστὶν αὐτοῦ παῤ ὀλίγοις, τὰς ψυχὰς τῷ λόγῳ καὶ ταῖς κατ' αὐτὸν πράξεσι κεκαθαρμένοις.—Origen, Contra Celsum, VII. § 8.

[4] I. § 46.

believers; for they suppose that we, like those whom they know to invent such things, invent them also. But God is the witness of our conscience, that it does not desire to recommend the divine doctrine of Jesus by false tales, but by clear and various arguments." Once more,[1] when replying to the objection of Celsus, that Jesus did no magnificent action which bespoke him to be God, he observes, "It is a magnificent act of Jesus, that *even to this day* those whom God pleases are healed in his name." And again, when contending against the same antagonist for the superior claims of Jesus to be accounted a God over those of Æsculapius, he observes how few there were who believed in Æsculapius, "whereas we can exhibit an unspeakable number of Greeks and barbarians, who confess Jesus. And some show signs of having received extraordinary endowments through that faith by their powers of healing; using over the patients no other invocation than God above all, and the name of Jesus, together with the history concerning him. For we have ourselves seen many thus delivered from severe maladies, and frenzies, and insanity, and numberless other complaints, such as neither man nor demon could cure."[2] Here, then, we see that Origen asserts a residue only of the miraculous Spirit which was once so operative in the Church to be then remaining in it, and speaks of traces only of it as then to be found, as though the age of miracles was passing away; but he still does insist on the actual existence of that spirit of miracles, and affirms that demons were still ejected, cures still wrought, and visions still vouchsafed, of which he himself, whatever scoffers might say to the contrary, had been a living witness—the moderation of the language in which this announcement is made, I repeat, a strong pledge for the truth of the facts it announces, and of the competency of the testimony.

The last contemporary authority which I shall produce is Cyprian. His testimony to the continuance of a miraculous interference in the affairs of the Church, I would say, rather

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 33.

[2] Τούτοις γὰρ καὶ ἡμεῖς ἑωράκαμεν πολλοὺς ἀπαλλαγέντας χαλεπῶν συμπτωμάτων.—III. § 24. See also Contra Celsum, III. § 28. Κατὰ τοὺς ἑξῆς χρόνους· ἐν οἷς οὐκ ὀλίγαι θεραπεῖαι τῷ Ἰησοῦ ὀνόματι καὶ ἄλλαι τινὲς ἐπιφάνειαι οὐκ εὐκαταφρόνητοι ἐπιτελοῦνται. And § 36. Εἰ γὰρ μὴ θεόθεν ἦν αὐτῷ δοθεῖσα σύστασις, οὐκ ἂν καὶ δαίμονες τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ ἀπαγγελλομένῳ μόνον εἴκοντες ἀνεχώρουν ἀπὸ τῶν ὑπ' αὐτῶν πολεμουμένων.

than the continuance of miraculous powers in it, is express and positive, chiefly, however, manifested by visions vouchsafed to himself or other conspicuous members of it.

In Ep. liv. he writes,[1] "We are aware that another persecution is coming on, and are admonished by *visions* to prepare for the conflict, and draw together Christ's soldiers into the camp." Again, in the same,[2] "Wherefore, at the suggestion of the Holy Spirit, and after that the Lord hath admonished us by *many and clear visions* that the enemy is at hand, we have thought well to gather Christ's soldiers into the camp." Again, in Ep. lxiii.,[3] "Wherefore, my brethren, if any of our predecessors, through ignorance, did otherwise than Christ's example in this teaches, let us who have been *admonished by Christ* (to this effect) *mix the cup*, and direct by letter our colleagues to do the same, that the rule may be uniform." Again, in Ep. lxix., to Pupianus, who had slandered him,[4] "If you show penitence, I may receive you again into communion, respect, however, being still had to this, that I first consult the Lord, whether by some ostensible warrant he will allow the peace of the Church to be granted you, and your readmission to be ratified, for I remember what manifestation hath been made to me already," &c.; and then he adds,[5] "although I am aware that *dreams* seem ridiculous to some, and *visions* foolishness, but it is so to those who had rather believe what is against the Priest than the Priest. But no wonder, since Joseph's brethren said to him, 'Behold this dreamer cometh, come let us slay him;' and yet that dreamer was confirmed, and his murderers were confounded." Again, in the "De Mortalitate,"[6] "when a certain colleague and brother Priest of ours anxious for death, prayed for his passport, there *stood near him*, when now at the point of death, a youth of venerable aspect, tall and striking . . . . . and said, Are you afraid to suffer?" &c. This, however, is a vision experienced by another, and by him when at the point of death.

Finally, there is a passage in Eusebius,[7] which occurs in a short preface with which he introduces the fragment of the letter of the martyrs of Lyons, to the following effect. "Mon-

[1] Ep. liv. § 1.
[2] § 5.
[3] lxiii. § 17.
[4] lxix. §§ 9, 10.
[5] § 10.
[6] De Mortalitate, § xix.
[7] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 3.

tanus and Alcibiades and Theodotus in Phrygia being then for the first time accounted by many to have the power of prophesying, for as there were very many other miracles of Divine grace *even yet* at that period wrought in different Churches, these created a belief in many that those persons also possessed the power of prophesying,"—a passage which, as on the one hand it seems to show that Eusebius had no idea that miracles were wrought in his own time, so does it seem equally to show, on the other hand, that he had no doubt they were wrought in the time of Montanus, Alcibiades, and Theodotus, or in the second century.

These, then, are not, indeed, all the notices we have of contemporary miracles, or supernatural agency, in the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries, but they are a very large portion of them, and are the facts in kind, if not quite in number, on which we have to build up our conclusions.

Now, in the first place, I must remark, what, indeed, I have partly done already in the course of the short comments I have given on the passages I have produced,—I must remark, that the witnesses, in many cases the eye-witnesses, who thus speak to the existence of extraordinary powers and extraordinary visitations in the Church of their own times, are men of various natural temperaments; their very writings prove it; calm, as Irenæus; or impetuous, as Tertullian—are men of more than one profession, for Minucius was a lawyer and so was Tertullian in his early days—are men, several of them, of great reading and knowledge, and of much experience; the infinite number of authors they some of them cite, the course of studies they describe themselves as having in several instances passed through, and the wide extent of the travels through which we can trace them, whether taken of choice or of necessity, and taken, moreover, in times the most stirring, being all pledges of that knowledge and experience—are men quite alive to the necessity of distinguishing between miracles and works of magic and conjuration, so common in their days; and of sifting the cases, which claimed to be supernatural, with that object especially in view[1];

[1] See, *e. g.* Contra Celsum, I. § 68, and II. § 50 (λεγέτω τις οὖν ἡμῖν εἰ δύναταί τι τῶν ἐν τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ ἢ τῶν παρὰ τῷ ἀποστόλῳ χώραν παρέχειν ὑπονοίας γοητείας), and elsewhere when he replies to the charge of the Jew in Celsus, that the miracles of Jesus were wrought by magic.

dwelling particularly, as some of them do, on the *moral* reformation which the proceedings of Jesus wrought on his followers, an effect so *contrary* even to that produced by magicians and conjurers on their dupes[1]—are men of unquestionable love for truth, enthusiastic zeal for it, submitting as they did for its sake to innumerable hardships and dangers in life, and some amongst them even to death itself—I say that when we consider that men of this character are the witnesses to the existence of these supernatural agencies in that age, we cannot but think their testimony weighty, or as our old writers would say, *considerable*, more especially when we call to mind that they speak from so many different quarters of the world, and still concur in the assertion of the fact itself—from Asia Minor, from Palestine, from Africa, from Gaul, from Italy. It is almost impossible, I repeat, to believe that there are not some substantial grounds for such a mass of assertion: and however some particulars of it may embarrass us, as *e. g.* the affirmation of Tertullian that the exorcism could be practised by any Christian, "a quolibet Christiano;"[2] whether the expression be a mere loose one, or whether the word "quolibet" be used by him in a sense of his own, which any one familiar with his style may well consider probable; or, as that other declaration of Irenæus, that even Jews could eject evil spirits too in the name of Jehovah, though the case of the Jews, who were exorcists, in the Acts,[3] proves that the evil spirits were indifferent to their adjuration by that name; or, as that of Origen, who ascribes a virtue to the name of the God of Abraham and of Isaac and of Jacob, by which demons were ejected by those who were not Jews as well as by Jews[4]—however, I say, these and other like diffi-

[1] See Contra Celsum, II. § 44, and again § 50. *Τίς γὰρ τὸν κρείττονα βιόν, καὶ συστέλλοντα τὰ τῆς κακίας δσημέραι ἐπὶ τὸ ἔλαττον, εὐλόγως φησὶν ἀπὸ ἀπάτης γίνεσθαι;*

[2] Tertullian, Apol. c. xxiii.

[3] Acts xix. 13.

[4] See Contra Celsum, IV. §§ 33. 35, and V. § 45, in which latter passage he says, "if the names Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob were translated into their equivalent meaning in the Greek, the phrase would have no more effect than the most indifferent words:" though it is remarkable that when giving further instances of the like effect produced by the names Israel, Sabaoth, Adonai, whilst expressed in the Hebrew, and of the inefficacy of the same when translated, he uses the expression *ὥς φασιν οἱ περὶ ταῦτα δεινοί*, and again, *ἐὰν δὲ τηρήσωμεν αὐτὸ, προσάπτοντες οἷς οἱ περὶ ταῦτα δεινοὶ συμπλέκειν αὐτὸ ᾠήθησαν*, "but if we retain the original word, coupling it with such other words as those *who are skilful in such matters* are used to couple it," as though Origen disclaimed all such powers of

culties may present themselves, and may no doubt be turned to account by those who are disposed to disparage these early reputed miracles; still the whole stream of primitive testimony sets in so strongly for the fact, that extraordinary powers were exercised by the Church of those days, that the truth of that fact *in the main* it is extremely hard to resist.

In the next place I will observe, that the miraculous powers of exorcism and of healing diseases, are those which the Fathers are far the most unanimous, as well as the most peremptory upon; that the speaking with tongues, prophesying, discerning of spirits, and above all, the raising the dead, are powers asserted by them indeed, but not near so universally or so determinately as the others. And this has been made matter of charge against the Fathers. But, on the other hand, it may be, and has been contended, that the terms in which our blessed Lord conferred miraculous powers on his immediate followers, and the manner in which they are related to have exercised those powers, coincide with such a condition of things; that they lead us to think, that the ejection of evil spirits and the curing of sicknesses were in fact to be, not the sole, but the principal fields in which the operation of the supernatural faculties, with which those followers were endowed, were to lie: thus, that St. Matthew tells us that our Lord's charge to the Apostles, when He sent them on their first mission, was this, "Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead, cast out devils;"[1] but when the Evangelist at the beginning of the same chapter had been giving a sort of heading of his own to this transaction, which he was about to describe a few verses afterwards, he, from whatever cause, perhaps because two only of the four faculties here vouchsafed were to be principally called into action, names but two of them, and those two the ejection of evil spirits and the healing of diseases; these are his words, "And when he had called unto him his twelve disciples he gave them power against unclean spirits to cast them out, and to heal all manner of sickness and all manner of disease:"[2] and that St. Mark, whether speaking of the same scene or of another, writes, "And he goeth up into a mountain, and calleth unto him whom he would;

incantation for himself, and devolved the onus of supporting the facts on other parties: this candour, however, in one instance, only making Origen's testimony, where it is not so qualified, more valuable in other instances.

[1] Matt. x. 8.

[2] x. 1.

and they came unto him; and he ordained twelve that they should be with him, and that he might send them forth to preach, and to have power to heal sicknesses, and to cast out devils;"[1] taking no notice of any other miraculous gifts, that were imparted to them: that when we look to the result of this mission of the Apostles, we find it recorded in these terms, "And they went out and preached that men should repent. And they *cast out many devils*, and anointed with oil many that were *sick*, and healed them;"[2] no mention being made of their having had occasion to exercise the other two faculties with which they had been endowed, that of cleansing the leper, or of raising the dead: that so again when our blessed Lord despatched the other seventy, two and two, to spread the Gospel, his charge to them was, as St. Luke informs us, "Heal the sick;"[3] and when they return and communicate to the Lord the success of their labours, it is in these terms, "Lord, even the devils are subject unto us through thy name:"[4] still the cure of diseases, and the casting out of unclean spirits the two miraculous gifts to which our attention is exclusively drawn: that such were the commissions, and such the issue of them, as they were first given by our Lord to his disciples when they had to act on them during his sojourn amongst men, as we find the facts recorded in the Gospels: but that after his resurrection, and before He went away, the final charge which He delivered to them was this, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned. And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name shall they *cast out devils;* they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall *lay hands on the sick*, and they shall recover;"[5] and if we consider the former charge as still in force, which we must, to the several powers here put into the disciples' hands, those of cleansing the leper, and of raising the dead must be added: that if, however, we examine the manner in which this charge was actually carried into effect, the actual use that was made of these gifts in the *Acts of the Apostles;* just as in the other case we traced the result of the mission in *the Gospels;* we

[1] Mark iii. 13, 14, 15.
[2] vi. 12, 13.
[3] Luke x. 9.
[4] x. 17.
[5] Mark xvi. 15–18.

shall find, as before, that of all the powers here allotted to the disciples, those of casting out devils and healing disease were still the two primary ones: that we have indeed instances of the dead being raised, but only two such instances, that of Tabitha, and that of Eutychus; three instances of the gift of tongues, that at Pentecost; that at Cornelius' house[1]; and that, when Paul laid his hands on John's disciples at Ephesus, twelve in number[2]; though in the Epistle to the Corinthians[3] there is incidental evidence of the use of tongues in that Church: that we have no instance of the cleansing of a leper: and none of poison having been drunk by a disciple with impunity; and but one of protection from the bite of a serpent: yet that numbers of instances of the ejection of devils, and of the cure of diseases are presented to us! "They brought forth the *sick* into the streets, and laid them on beds and couches, that at the least the shadow of Peter passing by might overshadow some of them. There came also a *multitude* out of the cities round about Jerusalem, bringing *sick folks*, and them that were vexed with *unclean spirits;* and they were healed every one;"[4] and again, when Philip went down to Samaria, and the people gave heed to the things which he spake, hearing and seeing the miracles which he did; what were those miracles? "Unclean spirits, crying with loud voice, came out of many that were possessed with them: and many taken with palsies, and that were lame, were healed; and there was great joy in that city;"[5] and again, when special miracles were wrought by the hands of Paul at Ephesus, we are told that "from his body were brought unto the sick handkerchiefs or aprons, and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them:"[6] that if then we find the instances of the gift of tongues, of prophecy, and above all of raising the dead, few in number as recorded in *ecclesiastical* writings, as compared with the instances of casting out devils and healing diseases; the same is true with respect to the Canonical Scriptures; and that the coincidence is in itself remarkable, if we consider that the fact does not perhaps strike us even in the Canonical Scriptures till our attention happens to be called to it, and we investigate the question: and that if such be the case, it is no matter for

[1] Acts x. 46. [2] xix. 6. [4] Acts v. 16. [5] viii. 7, 8.
[3] 1 Cor. xiv. [6] xix. 12.

wonder, if miracles which were more sparingly wrought, and which therefore had been witnessed by comparatively few persons, should be spoken of with less certainty by the Fathers; none of whom profess to have been themselves the agents of them: and that it is not reasonable to expect that Theophilus, *e. g.* or Irenæus should affirm contemporary cases of resurrection from the dead, as if they were things of ordinary occurrence, when even in the Acts of the Apostles, the number of such cases left on record is extremely limited, though the accounts of such as are found *there* are so circumstantial, in this respect so greatly differing from those of the Fathers, as to carry conviction to the mind at once.

Furthermore, it is argued, that though there is something distinct from miraculous agency in visions and dreams, of which, as we have seen, the later of the Ante-Nicene Fathers more especially speak very positively and very often; and though some may be enumerated which have no pretension to be reckoned amongst Divine communications, yet it is not easy to reject them all, attested as they are by persons of credit, who had the means of judging from results, and in action, as they are represented to have been, at peculiarly critical periods of the Church: that certainly the vision may often seem prompted by the circumstances of the party at the moment, as the visions which informed Cyprian of an approaching persecution, and might be resolvable into natural causes; but that still the same might be said of St. Peter's vision, which was no doubt closely connected with his physical wants at the time, for there is evidently a relation between his being "hungry" before the vision came on, and the character of the vision itself, which exhibited to him "four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air," which he was to "kill and eat;"[1] and the sacred narrative clearly means to mark that relation; and yet after all, that vision was made the vehicle of a revelation from God to guide his future conduct: and that we may say in general of early ecclesiastical visions, what we have said of early ecclesiastical miracles, that such phenomena are precisely in accordance with the proceedings of God as described in the Acts; of which visions are as remarkable a characteristic as casting out devils or healing diseases: and indeed, that

[1] Acts x. 10–12.

St. Peter's first sermon prepares us for them, where he quotes from the prophet Joel, that "it shall come to pass in the last days, saith God, I will pour out of my Spirit upon all flesh: and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy, and your young men shall see visions, and your old men shall dream dreams:"[1] that accordingly, St. Stephen sees our Lord before he is dragged forth to martyrdom[2]: and Saul was converted by a vision[3]: and there was the vision of Cornelius[4]: and a vision appeared to Paul, when "there stood a man of Macedonia;"[5] and at Corinth Christ spake to Paul "by a vision, Be not afraid:"[6] and in prison "the Lord stood by Paul and said, Be of good cheer:"[7] and aboard ship an angel stood by him "saying, Fear not, Paul, thou must be brought before Cæsar:"[8] and more examples might be added.

All this, I say, is contended; with what success I will not peremptorily pronounce; but leave it to thoughtful men to weigh and consider; at the same time adding, in conclusion, that whilst we contemplate this difficult question on the whole, we must remember that we do not rest ecclesiastical miracles or visions *merely* on the testimony of the Fathers to the facts, but we have it on the authority of revelation itself, that as the Apostles received the power of working miracles from Christ, so did some of those at least on whom the Apostles laid their hands, receive a power of doing the same from them. Thus we read in the sixth chapter of the Acts,[9] that the Apostles laid their hands on the seven Deacons; and we are then told,[10] that forthwith Stephen, one of the seven, "did great wonders and miracles among the people:" and again,[11] that the people of Samaria "with one accord gave heed unto these things which Philip spake," another of the seven, "hearing and seeing the miracles which he did;" so that the question only is, how far this virtue was transmitted; through what successive generations it lived. And though the Bishop of Lincoln's theory[12] is one which is well calculated to reconcile a sceptical age to the acceptance of ecclesiastical miracles in a degree, and though I have sometimes felt inclined to adopt it myself, yet on further reading and further examination of the subject, I am led to doubt if the testimony of the Fathers can

[1] Acts ii. 17.
[2] vii. 55.
[3] ix. 3–6.
[4] x. 3.
[5] xvi. 9.
[6] xviii. 9.
[7] xxiii. 11.
[8] xxvii. 23, 24.
[9] vi. 6.
[10] vi. 8.
[11] viii. 6.
[12] Account of the writings of Tertullian, p. 92, 3rd edit.

be squared to it, if it will satisfy the conditions of the case. The cessation of all miracles with the lives of those persons, on whom the Apostles themselves laid their hands, for that is the theory, would imply that miracles could not have been wrought in the middle of the third century, and yet Origen's testimony, which, as we have seen, is singularly candid and cautious, and on that account is deserving of more than ordinary respect, clearly and repeatedly, indeed more frequently than any other of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, affirms them to have co-existed with him, though in a less abundant measure than they once did; and Cyprian supports him: nor can such testimony be satisfactorily or safely explained away, I think, by the supposition of "a combined operation of prejudice and policy; of prejudice, which made the parties reluctant to believe the cessation of miracles; of policy, which made them anxious to conceal it." [1]

[1] Account of the writings of Tertullian, p. 93.

LECTURE VII.

Use of the Fathers in the inquiry concerning the *nature and construction of the Church*. The outline of it, which may be inferred from the Acts and the Apostolical Epistles, filled up by them. A standing ministry deriving its authority from the Apostles, and consisting of three Orders, included in their definition of it. Direct proof of this from the Fathers themselves: indirect, from the practice of heretics. Incidental character of the evidence. Variety of quarters from which it is drawn. Conclusion in the words of Hooker.

THERE is another field of theological inquiry, which it is impossible to occupy with any effect without the aid of the early Fathers: that relating to the nature and construction of the Church. Antiquity becomes in this province more especially the hand-maid of Scripture, and the Priest of the Church of England will find it eminently to his advantage here to fulfil his Ordination vow, and be diligent not only in reading the Holy Scriptures, but also "In such studies as help to the knowledge of the same." Our blessed Lord, indeed, remained upon earth after his resurrection forty days, and during that time was "Speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God."[1] But what his injunctions probably were, we have to gather from the course of events which followed, and from the shape which the Church began to take; the formation of it partly discovered in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles (for in these writings it exhibits a much more organized aspect than it did in the Gospels), and more fully developed in the writings of the Sub-Apostolic Fathers; these latter, however, be it remembered, not engaged in proclaiming and enforcing peculiar views of their own on this subject in the spirit of polemics, but simply betraying the structure which the Church had assumed in their time, its orderly uniformity,[2] the elements of it, as represented in the Acts and Epistles, thus completed and filled up.

[1] Acts i. 3. There may seem to be an allusion to one of these conversations of our Lord on the future structure of the Church in Clemens Romanus, Epist. I. § xliv.

[2] See Irenæus V. c. xx. § 1. Eandem figuram ejus, quæ est erga ecclesiam, ordinationis custodientibus.

The Fathers, then, understand the Church to be a body of persons called out of the world, amongst whom the doctrine is taught and the Sacraments administered, which Christ delivered, and which his Apostles and their successors perpetuated from generation to generation.[1] This standing ministry they ever represent, right or wrong, as deriving its virtue and authority from the commission first conveyed to the Apostles by Christ himself, and passed on from them to those who did or should succeed them by imposition of hands,[2] by vicarious ordination.[3] They appeal to this succession as the test of the validity of that ministry,[4] as the guarantee for the interpretation of Scripture sanctioned by the Church being Apostolical, and accordingly sound; no other interpretation having the same safeguard.[5] They actually trace it down to their own times in some instances, and profess to abstain from doing so in all other instances simply as being withheld by the tediousness of the task,[6] the succession in every Church being regular.[7] Those who withdrew from this ministry, thus limited, they regard as withdrawing from the Church, falling away from the truth, and as guilty of heresy and schism.[8] This ministry they uniformly describe as consisting of three Orders, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. They do not assert it in direct terms only, though in direct terms they do assert it, but incidentally also. They evidently presume it on all occasions. Nor is it one Father only that does so, but all; or, at least, all who touch upon the subject. The question does not rest upon any narrow basis, but if any one testimony were withdrawn, ample would remain. Here, as in so many other cases, the Fathers only take up a matter where the Scripture has laid it down. The dawn is in the one, the day in the other. We find Deacons mentioned in Scripture[9]; we find Presbyters[10]; we find Presbyters and

[1] Irenæus, Præf. lib. V.

[2] IV. c. xxvi. § 2.

[3] Cyprian, Ep. lxix. § 4; lxxv. § 16.

[4] Irenæus, Præf. lib. V.; Cyprian, lxxvi. § 3; Concil. Carthag. VII. Sententt. Clari à Masculâ.

[5] See Origen De Principiis, Præf. lib. I. § 2, and IV. § 9, Ἐχομένοις τοῦ κανόνος τῆς Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ κατὰ διαδοχὴν τῶν ἀποστόλων οὐρανίου ἐκκλησίας. And Irenæus, IV. c. xxvi. § 5. Ubi igitur charismata Domini posita sunt, ibi discere oportet veritatem, apud quos est ea quæ est ab apostolis ecclesiæ successio . . . qui . . . Scripturas sine periculo nobis exponunt.

[6] Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 2.

[7] Hegesippus, Routh. Reliq. Sacr. vol. i. p. 201, or Euseb. Eccles. Hist. iv c. 22.

[8] Irenæus, IV. c. xxvi. § 2; V. c. xx. § 1.

[9] Acts vi.; 1 Tim. iii. 12.

[10] Acts xiv. 23.

Apostles as united in act, yet distinguished in order[1]; we find those who were commissioned to rebuke some Presbyters and to reward some others with double honour[2]; to regulate the supply of ministers to the Church by a careful imposition of hands[3]; one such superior person or angel having the superintendence in each local Church.[4]

We discover these same distinctions reappearing in the short work of Hermas, which, whether the composition of St. Paul's friend or no, is certainly a work of the first century: Apostles, and Bishops, and Doctors, and Ministers (Apostoli, et Episcopi, et Doctores, et Ministri[5]) being, according to him, the several divisions of the hierarchy; Ministri an obvious translation of διάκονοι; Doctores being no less equivalent to Presbyteri, for Tertullian uses the same word in this sense, "si Episcopus, si Diaconus . . . si Doctor lapsus fuerit;"[6] and Cyprian actually talks of Presbyteri Doctores, explaining the one term by the other.[7]

Clemens Romanus leads us to draw the same inference with respect to the ranks of the clergy. He is enforcing on the quarrelsome Church of Corinth greater subordination and harmony. He intimates that it is God's pleasure that prayers should be offered at stated seasons, at stated places, and by stated persons. "They, therefore, who make their oblations," he continues, "at the times appointed, are accepted and blessed, for following the laws of the Lord they err not. For to the chief Priest are assigned his proper offices, and their proper part is assigned to the Priests, and their proper services are imposed upon the Levites. The layman is bound by the laws of the layman. Let each of you, then, brethren, in his own order (ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ τάγματι) give thanks to God with a good conscience, not overstepping the appointed rule of his ministration, in all gravity."[8] What could the illustration mean, when addressed to a Christian congregation quarrelling about their pastors, but a parallel between the Jewish and the Christian Priesthood? He then proceeds to tell historically of the Apostles planting in countries and cities the first fruits of their disciples as Bishops

[1] Acts xv. 2, 4.
[2] 1 Tim. v. 1, 17.
[3] v. 22.
[4] Rev. ii. 1, 8, &c.
[5] Hermas, Vis. III. § v.
[6] Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. iii.
[7] Cyprian, Ep. xxiv. See Bishop Pearson's Vind. Ignat. P. II. c. xiii.
[8] Clem. Rom. Ep. I. §§ xl. xli.

and Deacons[1]: the term Bishops, here synonymous with Presbyters, the Apostles yet being alive, and consequently the terms Bishop and Presbyter being yet confounded; the three orders, Apostles, Bishops (*i. e.* Presbyters), and Deacons, corresponding to the High Priest, Priest, and Levite, of whom Clemens has spoken just before; as after the death of the Apostles and the distinction established between the Bishop and Presbyter, the Bishop, Priest, and Deacon were the designations of the same.

The testimony of Ignatius on this subject is notorious. I confess I have seen nothing yet in the revived controversy on the genuineness of the ordinary copies of the Epistles of Ignatius, which seems to me weighty enough to set aside the verdict of Bishop Pearson—a verdict arrived at after an investigation the most elaborate, and by one whose qualifications for such a task (as all parties, I suppose, would allow) have never been approached by any theologian since his time. Bishop Pearson, then, not only is satisfied with the authority of the shorter Epistles, but further records his calm opinion of them, by deliberately quoting from the Epistle to the Trallians one of the most pointed passages in the whole series in his Exposition of the Creed, when, to support his assertion in the text, "As there is no Church where there is no order, no ministry; so where the same order and ministry are, there is the same Church,"[2] he adduces in the notes the saying of Ignatius, that "Without Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, there cannot be said to be a Church"[3]—a maxim which, strange as it may sound in many ears, is repeated by Cyprian, "If any one is not with the Bishop, he is not in the Church."[4] But even if we reduce Ignatius to the Syriac text recently discovered (which, for aught that appears to the contrary, might be just as well supposed to be an abridgment of the three letters, for it gives no more, as the three letters themselves), even thus his testimony to the three Orders cannot be stifled. "My life," says he, even according to this reading of the Epistle to Polycarp, "My life for those who are obedient to the Bishop, the Priests, and the Deacons; may it

[1] Clem. Rom. Ep. I. § xlii.
[2] Exposition of the Creed, p. 341, 11th Edit.
[3] Ignat. Ep. ad Trallianos, § iii.
[4] Si quis cum episcopo non sit, in Ecclesiâ non esse.—Cyprian, Ep. lxix. § 8.

be mine to have my portion in God with them. Co-operate with one another," he then continues, "striving together, run together, suffer together, repose together, watch together as the stewards of God, the assessors, the ministers," (*οἰκονόμοι, πάρεδροι, ὑπηρέται,*[1]) these three terms evidently answering to Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, each to each, and illustrating the difference understood to subsist among them in the mind of the writer. What need is there of further witness from him?

We next come to Irenæus, a Father of the highest value, from the light his writings cast on the state and structure of the Primitive Church, though composed with no such intention, but simply in order to expose the wild and mischievous features of heresies, most of them long since passed away. Still, as these heresies violated the principles of the Church in so many different ways, the reply to them naturally gives occasion to the production and assertion of those principles; and thus we obtain numerous glimpses of a Church, which might otherwise have been lost to us. Now, in the first place, it must be admitted that on several occasions where Irenæus is speaking in a loose and popular sense he uses the terms Bishops and Priests indifferently, as we might ourselves do at this day, when under the word Priesthood we might include the Episcopate, and call in colloquial language a Bishop, a Priest; and correctly enough. Thus, in one passage the expression "cum episcopatûs successione,"[2] appears to be changed for "cum Presbyterii ordine," which occurs shortly after.[3] Again, if we compare a paragraph in Book III. c. ii. § 2, with another in c. iii. § 1, we read in the former of the tradition preserved in the Churches by a succession of Presbyters (quæ per successiones Presbyterorum in ecclesiis custoditur); in the latter "by Bishops ordained in the Churches by the Apostles and their successors." And in a fragment of an Epistle of Irenæus to Florinus, Polycarp is designated as a blessed and Apostolical Presbyter[4]; whereas the same Polycarp is designated in the work against heresies as "Bishop of the Church of Smyrna."[5] I cite these passages in pure candour, for no man, I think, can peruse the pages of Irenæus

[1] Ignat. ad Polycarp, § vi.
[2] Irenæus, IV. c. xxvi. § 2.
[3] § 4.
[4] Fragm. II. p. 340, Bened. Ed.
[5] III. c. iii. § 4.

at full, and have a doubt of the evidence he affords to the fact of the Primitive Church being Episcopalian. Indeed, in these very instances there is nothing, as I have already said, to the contrary. For nobody disputes that in the Church there is a succession of Priests as well as a succession of Bishops, or that a Bishop may be properly called a blessed and Apostolical Priest. Turn we, then, to other passages in Irenæus more precise and technical in their character. He has occasion to challenge the heretics to test their tenets by tradition; by tradition properly guaranteed, beginning from the Apostles and continued by the Bishops, the successors of the Apostles, in all the Churches.[1] He takes the instance of the Church of Rome, and traces the succession of the Bishopric in that see, using in every case the term ἐπίσκοπος. "They conferred the ministration of the Bishopric on Linus. Anacletus succeeds him. After him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clemens receives the Bishopric . . . Evarestus succeeds Clemens, and Alexander Evarestus. Then Xystus is in the same manner appointed, being the sixth from the Apostles. After him Telesphorus, who suffered a glorious martyrdom. Then Hyginus; then Pius; after him Anicetus. Soter succeeded Anicetus. And Eleutherus has at this moment the office of the Bishopric, the twelfth in succession from the Apostles."[2] One Bishop and one Bishop only at a time, we perceive, recorded as presiding over the Church of Rome during this whole period. Yet the Christians, we know beyond all doubt, were already most numerous at Rome; "multitudo ingens" is the expression by which Tacitus designates them[3]; already requiring and receiving the services of a large number of Presbyters. Indeed, Eusebius happens to tell us, on the authority of a letter written by Cornelius Bishop of Rome to Fabius Bishop of Antioch, not more than sixty or seventy years later than the period we are upon, that there were then at Rome forty-six Presbyters, seven Deacons, and seven Sub-deacons, though still only one Bishop, viz. Cornelius. Indeed, Cornelius, as thus reported, makes it a matter of keen pleasantry that Novatus, of whose schismatical proceedings at Rome he was writing to Fabius, whilst setting himself up as he did for a champion of the Gospel, ὁ ἐκδικητὴς

[1] See also Tertullian, De Fugâ in Persecutione, § xiii.

[2] Irenæus, III. c. iii. § 3.

[3] Annal. XV. c. 44.

τοῦ εὐαγγελίου,[1] or as Cyprian has it "assertor evangelii,"[2] did not, to be sure, know that there ought to be in a Catholic Church but one Bishop; Cornelius evidently thinking that for a man to plume himself upon being evangelical or a scrupulous assertor of the Gospel, and at the same time so far to forget the Gospel as to imagine that there could be more than one Bishop in one Church, is an extreme anomaly. Look again at the character of the synod assembled by St. Paul at Miletus, as understood by Irenæus. "The Bishops," says he, "and Presbyters who were of Ephesus, and of the other neighbouring cities, having been called together."[3] Yet the verse in the Acts runs, "He sent to Ephesus and called the elders of the Church."[4] But in those other expressions in the same chapter, "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers" (ἐπισκόπους),[5] and "I know that ye all, among whom I have gone preaching the kingdom of God,"[6] Irenæus evidently read a convocation of the ruling clergy, not of Ephesus only, but of all the towns about, both Bishops and Priests; those Bishops, for instance, of whom St. John tells in the Revelation, the Bishop of Ephesus, the Bishop of Smyrna, the Bishop of Philadelphia, the Bishop of Sardis, the Bishop of Laodicea, the Bishop of Thyatira: or those of whom Ignatius makes mention even according to the recital of the substance of his Epistles in Eusebius, letting alone the Epistles themselves which we actually possess, the Bishop of Magnesia and the Bishop of Tralles.[7] Neither does Irenæus supply testimony for the existence of Bishops and Priests only, but of Deacons too; though here again by the way; for he tells us of a Deacon of Asia, who had been reported to him as having lost his wife through the intrigues of Marcus the heretic.[8] It is impossible that this sort of unobtrusive evidence for the three Orders in the Primitive Church should thus escape from these Fathers, one after another, without the fact being substantially true.

We next come to the evidence furnished on this question

[1] Ὁ ἐκδικητὴς οὖν τοῦ εὐαγγελίου οὐκ ἠπίστατο ἕνα ἐπίσκοπον δεῖν εἶναι ἐν καθολικῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. — Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 43.

[2] Novatus is called Novatianus by Cyprian, Ep. xli.

[3] Irenæus, III. c. xiv. § 2.

[4] Acts xx. 17.

[5] xx. 28.

[6] xx. 25.

[7] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iii. c. 36.

[8] Irenæus, I. c. xiii. § 5.

by Clemens Alexandrius, a writer on the whole as little concerned, from the nature and object of his works, with questions purely ecclesiastical as any that can be named. It would not, indeed, have been matter of surprise, if no passage in the whole of them had occurred illustrating the subject before us: and as it is, the passages are very few, and the information communicated in a manner the most informal and oblique; indeed, in a manner evidently bespeaking that the author was living in an Episcopal Church, and consequently had his casual thoughts occasionally tinged by the subject, as they might be by any other which was habitually present before him, but nothing more. Thus the Pædagogue (the title of one of his treatises,) whose office is merely elementary and practical, is represented, whilst conducting his children to school, to deliver them into the hands of a more profound master, as throwing out for their benefit a few of the precepts of the Gospel, and with that contenting himself; his province not extending further; and though there are "maxims," says he, "in the sacred books, relating to particular persons, written, some for Presbyters, others for Bishops, others for Deacons, and others for widows," yet he declines for his part engaging with them, leaving the application of them to other hands.[1] It will be seen at once that Clemens, when he penned these words, had no idea of proving to posterity that there were three Orders in the Church; it is not the point his mind was adverting to; his object simply was to put into the mouth of his Pædagogue a characteristic speech, namely, that he would not meddle with matters which belonged rather to the head-master's task, to whom he was about to turn over his young charge. At the same time, that when he used the terms Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, he used them distinctively, as representing the several grades of the hierarchy, is evident both from the turn of the passage itself, which asserts that the Scriptures contained precepts calculated for the guidance of different persons whose duties were different, each adapted to each, *αἱ μὲν* (sc. *ὑποθῆκαι*) *πρεσβυτέροις, αἱ δὲ ἐπισκόποις, αἱ δὲ διακόνοις*, as though each order had its own work; but also the same inference follows from another passage not less incidental in its tenour than this, but equally conclusive. It

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xii. p. 309.

occurs in the Stromata.[1] Clemens is inculcating what is his great object in that treatise, the possibility of a progressive advance of the Divine character amongst men, and he urges in proof of this the example of the Apostles; "for the Apostles," says he, "were not chosen from any particular congruity of nature; for Judas was chosen with them; but they were qualified to become Apostles, being chosen by Him who could foresee events. Wherefore Matthias, who was not chosen with them, having shown himself worthy of being an Apostle, was substituted for Judas. So that it is still open for those who exercise themselves in the Lord's precepts, and live according to the Gospel in perfection and knowledge, to be numbered amongst the elect Apostles. That man is, in truth, the Presbyter of the Church, and the real Deacon (or minister) of the will of God, who does and teaches the commandments of the Lord; himself not ordained of man, nor accounted just, because he is a Presbyter, but numbered amongst the Presbyters because he is just; and though he should not be honoured in this world with the primacy (*πρωτοκαθεδρίᾳ*), yet will he sit among the four and twenty thrones, and judge the people, as saith John in the Revelation." And afterwards there is added, "for the several grades of the Church here of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, are imitations, I imagine, of the glories of the angels; and they attain unto that dispensation which the Scriptures say awaits those who live according to the Gospel in the steps of the Apostles in perfect righteousness.[2] The Apostle writes that these being taken up into the clouds, shall first of all *minister*, or serve the office of Deacon; then be numbered amongst the Presbytery by an advance in glory, for glory differs from glory, until they arrive at the perfect man." Here, I repeat, as in the former case, the information we obtain on the question we are investigating, is altogether incidental. Clemens is not engaging in a debate on Episcopacy, or evincing the slightest intention of conveying to us any testimony whatever with respect to it; but having occasion to enforce the duty of going on unto perfection, he casually illustrates the stages of

[1] Stromat. VI. § xiii. p. 793.

[2] *Ἐπεὶ καὶ αἱ ἐνταῦθα κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν προκοπαὶ, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, μιμήματα, οἶμαι, ἀγγελικῆς δόξης, κἀκείνης τῆς οἰκονομίας τυγχάνουσιν, ἣν ἀναμένειν φασὶν αἱ γραφαὶ τοὺς κατ' ἴχνος τῶν ἀποστόλων ἐν τελειώσει δικαιοσύνης κατὰ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον βεβιωκότας.* — Ibid.

which the Christian life admits by the grades the Christian Church adopts in her ministry; an image familiar to his own mind, and familiar, as he felt, to those whom he was addressing; the very nature of his argument meanwhile requiring that these grades should rise one above another; and that as the Priest was superior to the Deacon, so was the Bishop to the Priest.

And here may be a proper place to remark, that we have clear proof there is no arguing, that the Fathers confound the Bishop and Presbyter, because they occasionally include both under the latter name; for I look upon it as shown to a demonstration that Clemens drew a positive distinction between the Bishop and Presbyter, and yet we shall find him in another place, when descanting on the nature of the service which the true Gnostic renders to God, dividing all service into the *emendatory* and the *ministerial*, and having illustrated this division in some other ways, he goes on to say, "in like manner with respect to the Church, the Presbyters maintain the emendatory character, the Deacons the ministerial,"[1] as though these were the only two orders in the Church; whereas the truth evidently is, from what has already transpired, that he must have included the Bishop in the Presbyter.

The language of Tertullian, on this subject, is coincident with that of every other Father we have adduced; but still be it remembered, it is not the language of a man debating a point, but of one touching on it in the course of the argument he happens to have in hand, whatever it may be. And whatever obscurity there may have been thought to attach to this whole question of Church government arises mainly from this, that the Fathers are in no instance making it the express topic of discussion. They are not, any of them, writing treatises on Episcopacy. Even Ignatius himself is doing no such thing as this; but carried away from his diocese to suffer death, leaving it in the meanwhile without a head, the duties of his own office and position, and solicitude about a successor trouble him, and naturally turn his thoughts to the more immediate contemplation of the mutual relations of the Bishop and clergy. Hence the fuller information his writings are calculated to afford us on the structure of the Church. To

[1] Stromat. VII. § i. p. 830.

return, however, to Tertullian. In his "De Præscriptione Hæreticorum," he is meeting the objection that some may probably be scandalized at seeing an example of defection from the faith, even amongst confirmed Christians; but "what," says he, "if a Bishop, or a Deacon, or a widow, or a virgin, or a Doctor (Presbyter), or even a martyr, should fall from the rule, must heresies on that account be considered the truth? Do we prove the faith from the man, or the man from the faith?"[1] And again in the tract "De Fugâ in Persecutione," in a passage, the purport of which corresponds with that of this passage, he is maintaining the duty of steadfastness under persecution, and especially on the part of the more distinguished members of the Church, "for when the leaders themselves," says he, "that is, the very Deacons, Priests, and Bishops flee, how can the laity understand in what sense it was said, Flee from city to city?"[2] His argument on both these occasions, it is perceived, requires him to speak of persons who held conspicuous stations in the Church, and accordingly his pen at once puts down Bishops, Doctors or Presbyters, and Deacons, as of that number. What the difference between them might be, he does not hint, as the argument does not lead him to do so; but the very array of the names suffices to show that he contemplated a difference. This difference is yet more marked in another celebrated passage in the former tract, for it happens to constitute the force of it, to which I have before had occasion to refer.[3] He is animadverting upon the prostration of all discipline, the confusion of all order, which characterised the constitution and proceedings of the heretics. "Accordingly," says he, "one is Bishop to-day, another to-morrow; he is to-day a Deacon, who is to-morrow a Reader; to-day a Presbyter, who is to-morrow a layman; for they assign priestly offices even to laymen."[4] The distinction of these offices, according to the Church, is evidently represented as forming a strong contrast with the confusion made in them by the heretics. Tertullian does not labour, be it observed, to prove that such distinction did subsist, but takes it for granted; regards it as a point on which there cannot be two opinions. But there is yet

[1] Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. iii.
[2] De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. xi.
[3] Lecture VIII. First Series.
[4] Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xli.

another passage in the same author which conveys to us the clear impression on his mind, that the order of Bishop was superior to the other orders of the clergy, as much as if he had declared it in so many words, and had penned the paragraph for no other purpose. Yet he had no such intention when he wrote it, but simply that of accounting for the secession of Valentinus, the founder of the sect which went by his name, from the Church.[1] "Valentinus," says he, "had expected a Bishopric (Episcopatum), being a man of genius and eloquence, but indignant that another, who had a martyr's" (or rather confessor's) "prerogative to show, had obtained the office, he broke away from the canonical Church, after the manner of persons ambitious of *precedence* who are wont to seek revenge, and set about assailing the truth"; not to speak of the same Father assigning to the Bishop potential rights peculiar to him; as, for instance, that of appointing to the order of widows, and so assigning to the party a maintenance[2]; that of enjoining public fasts on special occasions, and collections of alms to be made at them.[3]

And here, again, the remark which I threw out with respect to the testimony of Clemens is equally pertinent, that it is impossible to draw an argument against Episcopacy from the Fathers expressing themselves from time to time on the subject of Church government in such language as does not necessarily imply it. For we have just seen that Tertullian repeatedly distinguishes between the order and functions of the Bishop and of the Priest; yet we find him in the Apology, when he was addressing heathens on whom these distinctions would be lost, designating the leaders of the Church in the general terms, "præsident probati quique seniores,"[4] as though the government might have been Presbyterian; and for the same reason we may have observed Justin Martyr before him employing the comprehensive word ὁ προεστὼς,[5] for the ecclesiastic who administered the Christian rites; not that he confounded Bishops and Priests, but that the circumstances of the case did not induce him to be more specific in the mention of them.

Turn we next to Origen, and still we have another testi-

[1] Adversus Valentinianos, c. iv.
[2] De Virginibus Velandis, c. ix.
[3] De Jejuniis, c. xiii.
[4] Apol. c. xxxix.
[5] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 67.

mony on the side of the three Orders, and of as incidental a kind as that just cited from Tertullian; leading us to the inference, that, in his mind, the difference of rank between the Bishop and Priest was wide. It occurs in his treatise concerning Prayer, and whilst he is engaged in explaining and enlarging upon the Lord's Prayer. Accordingly he approaches in its turn the clause of that prayer, "and forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors," and having set forth various ways in which we are all debtors to God and Christ, he adds, "then besides these more Catholic parties, there is the debt of the widow, which is provided for by the Church, and another of the Deacon, and another of the Presbyter, and the heaviest debt of all of the Bishop, a debt required by the Saviour of the whole Church, and to be judicially exacted by him, unless it be paid:"[1] the magnitude of the debts of the Bishop proportioned to the dignity, authority, and responsibility of his office; the latter, therefore, regarded by Origen as much surpassing, in these respects, that of the Presbyter, and of course still more that of the Deacon. Again, Origen finds a difficulty in St. Paul's injunction with respect to single marriage, and suggests (for it is confessedly a speculation, a sort of random thought thrown out till something better occurred to some other interpreter of Scripture) whether this monogamy might not have some symbolical meaning. But he introduces his theory thus. "From what has been said, I am disposed to turn my attention to the law respecting the writing of divorcement, whether, since the Bishop, the Priest, and the Deacon, are symbols of certain matters of faith in accordance with those names, (Paul) might not mean that those parties should be symbolically monogamists:"[2] the three orders obviously presenting themselves to his mind spontaneously, as expressing the ecclesiastical body to whom the precepts of the Apostles appertained; Origen, at the moment, never dreaming of furnishing us with evidence on the question of Episcopacy.

[1] Χωρὶς δὲ τούτων καθολικωτέρων ὄντων, ἔστι τις χήρας προνοουμένης ὑπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ὀφειλὴ, καὶ ἑτέρα διακόνου, καὶ ἄλλη πρεσβυτέρου, καὶ ἐπισκόπου δὲ ὀφειλὴ βαρυτάτη ἐστὶν ἀπαιτουμένη ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆς ὅλης ἐκκλησίας σωτῆρος καὶ ἐκδικουμένη εἰ μὴ ἀποδιδῶται. —Origen, De Oratione, § 28, vol. i. p. 253.

[2] Ἐκ δὲ τῶν εἰρημένων εἰς τὸν περὶ τοῦ βιβλίου τῆς ἀποστασίας νόμον ἐφίστημι, μήποτε ἐπεὶ σύμβολόν ἐστι καὶ ὁ ἐπίσκοπος, καὶ ὁ πρεσβύτερος, καὶ ὁ διάκονος ἀληθινῶν κατὰ τὰ ὀνόματα ταῦτα πραγμάτων, ἐβουλήθη αὐτοὺς συμβολικῶς μονογάμους καταστῆσαι, κ.τ.λ. — Comment. in Matt. tom. xiv. vol. iii. p. 646.

The Father we come next to in order—for I am showing that I spoke accurately when I said in the beginning of this Lecture, that the question rested upon no narrow basis, but was supported by the universal testimony of the Primitive Church—is Cyprian. The light he throws upon the subject of Episcopacy is very great. Many controversies had by his time risen in the Church, which called forth Episcopal interference, and thus became the means of conveying to us an ample knowledge of the Episcopal character and functions of those times. The treatment of the lapsed, the recommendations (or libelli) of the confessors, Baptism by heretics, and a variety of other debatable points both ecclesiastical and theological, in which Cyprian is consulted, serve to develope the construction of the Church of his day, almost as fully as an explicit treatise would have done; more especially as a persecution had withdrawn the Bishop for some interval from his Diocese, and consequently had given occasion to much intercourse by letter between Cyprian and his Church, a correspondence which is still preserved. It would be tedious to produce the numberless passages in which this Father refers to the three Orders. He writes to the Priests and Deacons of Rome on the event of their Bishop's death.[1] He repeatedly addresses as their Bishop the Priests and Deacons of his own Church during his temporary absence from them, and urges on them various duties.[2] We gather from his Epistles, that a Bishop was in a position to command the Priests and Deacons, to reprove, to admonish them, to proceed against the refractory, to provide against irregularities in the Church of all kinds[3]; to administer the Church in many matters according to his own discretion.[4] We perceive from them that in the vacancy of a see many ecclesiastical affairs were suspended till the appointment of a successor[5]; that for Presbyters to act on their own account and without reference to their Bishop was a thing unprecedented[6]: above all, that it was his prerogative to ordain; and that with a view to this he examined the qualifications of the

[1] Cyprian, Ep. iii.

[2] Epp. iv. v. xvii.

[3] His literis et hortor et mando.—Ep. v. § 2. Epp. ix. xxviii. lxv.

[4] Ep. lxxii.

[5] Ep. xxxi. § 5.

[6] Quod enim non periculum metuere debemus de offensâ Domini quando aliqui de presbyteris, nec evangelii nec loci sui memores, sed neque futurum Domini judicium neque nunc sibi præpositum episcopum cogitantes, quod nunquam omnino sub antecessoribus factum est, cum contumeliâ et contemptu præpositi totum sibi vindicent.—Ep. ix. § 1.

candidates[1]; consulted the clergy and even the people upon them[2]; yet was competent to ordain of his own knowledge without this appeal, when the merits of the candidate were conspicuous.[3]

Moreover, it would appear, which is a distinct and very powerful argument on the side of the Episcopal being the primitive form of Church government, that the primitive heretics themselves, dissatisfied after all with the position they had chosen, affected a similar hierarchy of their own; thus in spite of themselves offering a testimony to the stringency of that institution, and the obligation there was upon all Christians to abide by it; and adopting the names of the several orders of clergy in the Church, they exposed themselves to the censure of the Church Catholic, which uniformly affirmed that to make those names of value, they must represent a clergy who had derived their authority by uninterrupted succession from the Apostles; and that wanting that, they wanted everything which constituted the call.[4]

In conclusion, I would once more draw the attention of my hearers to the nature of the evidence for the three Orders and an Episcopal Church, which has been submitted to them, because I think the character of it gives it a weight of its own. None of the Fathers, it will be observed, wrote expressly on the subject of Episcopacy; I mean as controversialists, or with a view to determine a debatable question. They none of them appeal, as we should now do, in discussing this point, to texts in the Epistles to Timothy or Titus, or to other texts elsewhere of a similar import, construing them in this way or that, in order to support their side of the argument, whichever it might be. They afford no tokens of having any misgivings in their mind upon the question; and consequently the evidence which they furnish upon it, is simply that which escapes from them when they are handling other matters, or matters bearing more or less upon the principles of Church government. I do not remember any passage which would

[1] Cyprian, Ep. xxiv.

[2] Quod et ipsum videmus de divinâ auctoritate descendere, ut sacerdos plebe præsente sub omnium oculis deligatur et dignus atque idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur.—Ep. lxviii. § 4.

[3] In ordinationibus clericis, fratres charissimi, solemus vos ante consulere, et mores ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare. Sed expectanda non sunt testimonia humana cum præcedunt divina suffragia.—Ep. xxxiii.

[4] See, *e.g.* Irenæus, V. c. xx. § 1. Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxxii.

seem to militate against this opinion, unless it be one in Clemens Romanus, and this only *seems* to do so. "So likewise our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ, that contentions would arise on account of the overseership or episcopacy (ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς). For which reason, having perfect foreknowledge, they appointed persons such as we have before said, and then gave directions how, when they should die, other chosen and appointed men should succeed to their ministry;"[1] that is, not that there would be debates about the term Ἐπίσκοπος and its meaning, but that there would be strifes about who should have the pre-eminence in the Church: to prevent which the Apostles laid down a rule of ecclesiastical succession, which should obviate the inconvenience. Accordingly, it is the incidental manner in which we have to possess ourselves of such testimony as the Fathers bear to an Episcopal Church, which produces whatever defect there may be, or may be supposed to be, in its clearness. But on the other hand, in proportion as this circumstance may deduct from its precision, it augments its value; for it is supplied without any reference to serving a cause, or maintaining a party; and if after all it proves, as I cannot help thinking it does, conclusive of the question of an Episcopate, it is so in a very abundant degree.

In the next place, I would direct consideration to the great variety of quarters from which this evidence is drawn. It speaks to the structure not of one local Church, but of Churches the most unconnected and remote, of those in France, in Italy, in Greece, in Asia Minor, in Egypt, in Mauritania; in short, in almost all the countries on the borders of the Mediterranean, the choicest and earliest of Christendom; and it is furnished by men of all temperaments, sober and impassioned, philosophical and visionary; in works of various kinds; in Apologies, in letters, in speculative treatises, in controversial ones; by men who lived one or other of them from the age of the Apostles to nearly that of Constantine; the only period during which the question of Episcopacy could admit of any doubt or debate whatever.

And thus, I finally think we may adopt towards the Dissenters the language which Hooker addressed to the learned among the Puritans, and say, "A very strange thing sure it

[1] Clem. Rom. Ep. I. § xliv.

were, that such a discipline as ye speak of should be taught by Christ and his Apostles in the Word of God, and no Church ever have found it out, nor received it till this present time; contrariwise, the government against which ye bend yourselves be observed everywhere throughout all generations and ages of the Christian world, no Church ever perceiving the Word of God to be against it. We require you to find out but one Church upon the face of the whole earth, that hath been ordered by your discipline, or hath not been ordered by ours, that is to say, by episcopal regiment, sithence the time that the blessed Apostles were here conversant."[1]

[1] Hooker's Eccles. Pol. Pref. ch. iv. § 1, vol. i. p. 193, Keble's Ed.

LECTURE VIII.*

Use of the Fathers in settling the *Canon* of the New Testament. Appeal to them in the sixth Article. Method of establishing the Canon stated by Jones. Illustration of this method with reference to the Gospels, the Acts, the Epistles, the Revelation. Discussion of questions, whether the autographs of the Apostles existed in the time of Tertullian; whether any Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians is missing; whether the Epistle to the Ephesians is rightly so entitled; whether St. Paul was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Use of the Fathers in proving that the *substance* of the Canonical books, the beginnings and endings of the Gospels, the incidents of our Lord's ministry, the circumstances recorded in the Acts, the tenour of the Epistles, were the same in their times as they are now.

THE next subject on which the use of the Fathers will discover itself—a subject indeed which may still be ranged under the head of Evidences, if we take that term in an extended sense—is the *Canon*, the *substance*, the *text*, and the *meaning*, of Scripture. On these points the writings of the Fathers will be found to give us most invaluable information.

I can only undertake to call your *attention* to a question so prolific; a question, which in itself and alone would require volumes to exhaust. But far less than this will suffice to convince you, that these most important topics cannot be investigated fully, and some of them scarcely at all, without the help of the Fathers.

Thus, with respect to the *Canon*, our sixth Article challenges an examination of early ecclesiastical authors for the purpose of establishing it. "In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church," is its language. Our Church, therefore, directs

* I might here have introduced a Lecture on the use of the Fathers as ministering to our knowledge of our Liturgy and showing that the foundations of our Prayer Book were laid in Apostolic and Sub-Apostolic times; but as I did this at length in my Lectures on the Prayer Book, and shall do it again when I repeat that course, I shall proceed to another topic.

or at least encourages us to acquaint ourselves with ecclesiastical antiquity, in order to see what Scriptures were received from the earliest times without hesitation, and what were rejected; and so to satisfy ourselves of her own catalogue. And Mr. Jeremiah Jones, who discusses this question with great learning and ability, sets out with this proposition; that "the principal means whereby we can know whether any books be canonical is by tradition; or the well-approved testimonies of those who lived in or near the time of their being first written."[1]

Thus amidst the number of *Gospels* which swarmed in the first ages, many of them apparently as early as St. Luke himself, who alludes to them in the Preface to his own Gospel, we learn from ecclesiastical antiquity, there were four, and four only, canonical; and those four we further learn, as I shall presently show, were the same we now possess. You are, no doubt, aware of the remarkable testimony to this effect, of Irenæus; who maintains that as there are four cardinal points, and as the Church is dispersed over the whole earth, there must be four pillars to support it; and that, therefore, the Word gave four Gospels.[2] The theory, to be sure, is puerile, but the fact is conclusive; as may be the reason assigned by the same author for the omission of the tribe of Dan from the number of the sealed—viz. that Antichrist was to come of that tribe—still the testimony is complete, that in the time of Irenæus the text of the Revelation in this instance was what it now is.[3] And Clemens Alexandrinus in a paragraph, which I brought before you on a former occasion, confirms the statement of Irenæus; and in a manner no less incidental; for having cause to reply to a passage in a document which professed to report a saying of our Lord, Clemens observes, "in the first place we do not find this saying in our four Gospels;"[4] as though no others were of authority.

The same Irenæus clearly announces the *Acts of the Apostles* as a canonical book; assigns it to St. Luke[5]; quotes it largely as furnishing the sentiments of the Apostles, to the confusion of those of his heretical antagonists, and to the support of

[1] Jones on the Canon, Part I. ch. vii.
[2] Irenæus, III. c. xi. § 8.
[3] V. c. xxx. § 2.
[4] Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐν τοῖς παραδεδομένοις ἡμῖν τέτταρσιν εὐαγγελίοις οὐκ ἔχομεν τὸ ῥητόν. — Clem. Alex. Stromat. III. § xiii. p. 553.
[5] Irenæus, III. c. xiv. § 1.

his own.[1] He speaks of the *Epistles of Paul* as among the Scriptures; objecting to the heretics the mutilation of these Epistles, as the mutilation of the Scriptures.[2] He ascribes the Epistle to the Romans to St. Paul[3]; both the Epistles to the Corinthians to the same author[4]; the Epistle to the Galatians[5]; the Epistle to the Ephesians[6]; the Epistle to the Philippians[7]; the Epistle to the Colossians[8]; still to the same. The first Epistle to the Thessalonians he quotes more than once, and introduces the quotation by the phrase "the Apostle in his first Epistle to the Thessalonians;" doubtless meaning St. Paul by the Apostle, though in these cases not happening to name him, as would probably be our own way of reference to that Scripture.[9] The second Epistle to the Thessalonians, however, which he quotes yet more frequently, he actually assigns to St. Paul; and by calling it the second Epistle, which he does, proves that he knew the first to be by the same hand.[10] The first Epistle to Timothy he cites, as in the last case, under the general designation of the Apostle's.[11] The second Epistle also as in the last case he cites, giving it to St. Paul as its author[12]; and in one passage comprises the two under the term ἐν ταῖς πρὸς Τιμόθεον ἐπιστολαῖς.[13] The Epistle to Titus he refers to as St. Paul's.[14] To the Epistle to Philemon he has no allusion, the only Epistle of St. Paul of which this can be predicated: but the extreme brevity of that Epistle, and its unfitness for controversial purposes, which were those of Irenæus, may very well account for the omission. The Epistle to the Hebrews he appeals to, but without happening to name either its title or its author[15]; though in another of his works entitled περὶ διαλεξεων διαφόρων, "concerning different dissertations," now lost, Eusebius tells us he did make positive mention of the Epistle to the Hebrews.[16] The Epistle of St. James he also quotes from; but, as in the last instance, neither names the title nor the writer.[17] The commentators, indeed, assign but one reference to this Epistle;

[1] Irenæus, III. c. xii. §§ 1, 2, 3.
[2] III. c. xii. § 12.
[3] II. c. xxii. § 2; IV. c. xxxiv. § 2.
[4] I. c. viii. § 2; II. c. xxvi. § 1; V. c. xiii. Compare § 1 and § 3; and compare IV. c. xxviii. § 3.
[5] III. c. vii. §§ 1, 2.
[6] I. c. viii. § 4.
[7] V. c. xiii. Compare § 2 and §§ 3, 4.
[8] Compare V. c. xiv. § 2; I. c. iii. § 4.
[9] V. c. vi. § 1.
[10] III. c. vii. Compare §§ 1, 2.
[11] I. Præf. § 1; IV. c. xvi. § 3.
[12] III. c. xiv. § 1. [13] III. c. iii. § 3.
[14] I. c. xvi. § 3; III. c. iii. § 4.
[15] II. c. xxx. § 9; III. c. vi. § 5.
[16] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. v. c. 26.
[17] Irenæus, IV. c. xvi. § 2.

I think, however, there is clearly a second.[1] The first Epistle of St. Peter he produces, and gives it to that Apostle[2]; and adopts a phrase from the second Epistle without saying from whence he took it.[3] The first and second Epistles of St. John he cites, assigning them to that Apostle.[4] To the third Epistle he has no allusion; probably for the same reason as he has none to the Epistle to Philemon: nor yet to the Epistle of St. Jude. The book of the Revelation he uses very largely, and as the writing of St. John.[5]

Only observe, therefore, of how great value is even this single Father in assuring our minds with respect to the Canon, the groundwork of everything[6]; who, without the most remote intention of conveying to us any information on this most important matter, and merely quoting such Scriptures as happened to be of use to his argument, actually bears testimony, and in most of the cases very abundant testimony, to every book of the New Testament included in our Canon, except the Epistle to Philemon, the third Epistle of St. John, and the Epistle of St. Jude; all of which would not occupy more than a couple of octavo pages; and for which, short as they are, similar testimony may be gathered from other quarters, but those quarters still the Fathers.

Thus a phrase in Theophilus, and a very remarkable phrase, bears every appearance of having been borrowed from one in the Epistle to Philemon; though I do not perceive any notice taken of it by the Editors of Theophilus. "You object to me," says he to Autolycus, "the name of Christian, as though it were a bad name to bear. But I confess myself a Christian, and I bear that name which is beloved of God, for I hope to be acceptable to God (*εὔχρηστος τῷ Θεῷ*). For it cannot be, as you suppose, that the name of God should be an evil. But, perhaps, you think as you do concerning God, being yourself unacceptable to God" (*ἄχρηστος τῷ Θεῷ*[7]). The play of the words is exactly the

[1] Irenæus, I. c. iv. § 4. Compare James iii. 11.

[2] IV. c. ix. § 2.

[3] V. c. xxiii. § 2. As it may be observed, by the way, Theophilus does also, Ad Autolycum, II. § 13. *Τοῦτό ἐστιν ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ, φαίνων ὥσπερ λύχνος ἐν οἰχήματι συνεχομένῳ.*—Compare 2 Pet. i. 19.

[4] III. c. xvi. § 5; I. c. xvi. § 3; III. c. xvi. § 8.

[5] IV. c. xx. § 11.

[6] Hooker's Eccles. Pol. III. c. viii. §§ 13, 14.

[7] Theophilus, Ad Autolycum, I. § 1.

same as in the 11th verse of the Epistle to Philemon. "I beseech thee for my son Onesimus, whom I have begotten in my bonds, which in time past was to thee unprofitable (*τόν ποτέ σοι ἄχρηστον*) but now profitable to thee and to me" (*νυνὶ δέ σοι καὶ ἐμοὶ εὔχρηστον*). Tertullian, however, furnishes still clearer evidence to this book of Scripture, short and domestic as it is. For when making himself merry with the absurdities of the Valentinians, he supposes that at the final consummation one of their choice partisans, Marcus or Caius, by a spiritual conjunction with the angels (according to the Valentinian theory) may chance to bring forth an Onesimus [1]; in evident allusion to St. Paul's phrase with respect to him which he uses to Philemon, that he had "begotten Onesimus in his bonds."[2] Moreover, there is the strongest reason for believing that some words, which made mention of the Epistle to Philemon, have dropped out of the text of this same author in the conclusion of his fifth book against Marcion [3]; the paragraph immediately following such lacuna being this, "The brevity of this Epistle alone" (no Epistle having been previously named as the text now stands) "has saved it from the mutilating hands of Marcion. Yet I wonder, when he admits a letter addressed to one individual, why he should reject two addressed to Timothy, and one to Titus, all composed on the state of the Church. But he affected, I presume, to innovate as to the number of the Epistles." It is difficult to understand this paragraph in any other way, than as containing a reference to the Epistle to Philemon: for it is clearly a reference to some *brief* Epistle of St. Paul addressed to an *individual*, and that individual neither Timothy, nor Titus; of which Epistle mention had been previously made, which mention, therefore, must have escaped from the text. It is to our present purpose also to observe, that the expression, "but he affected, I presume, to innovate as to the number of the Epistles," in this passage of Tertullian, clearly shows that the number of the Canonical Epistles of St. Paul was fixed and notorious when Tertullian wrote; for he intimates, we see, that as Marcion was in other respects a mutilator of Scripture, so might he be disposed to have an opinion of his

[1] Tertullian, Adv. Valentinianos, c. xxxii.

[2] Philemon, 10.

[3] Tertullian, Adv. Marcionem, V. c. xxi.

own, and contrary to that commonly entertained, on the Canon of that Apostle's Epistles.

But to proceed; I doubt whether any reference, unquestionably such, can be found to the third Epistle of St. John in any Ante-Nicene Father. For the phrase, εἰρήνη σοι, "Peace be to thee," which occurs, and apparently as a quotation, in Clemens Alexandrinus,[1] and is by some supposed to be taken from the 14th verse of the third Epistle of St. John, is so short and so trivial a one, that it may be disputed whether it bears out the reference. Clemens, however, certainly speaks of what John says "in his greater Epistle,"[2] thus implying that there was another, or others: and Origen (who by the way speaks of the Scriptures of the Old and the New Testament in the familiar phrase of our own day,[3] and pronounces the inspiration of the one as emphatically as of the other,[4]) in Eusebius expressly makes mention of the third.[5] The Epistle of St. Jude is quoted abundantly and under the name of the author both by Clemens,[6] and Tertullian.[7]

This may suffice to show the manner in which the Fathers may be made tributary to establishing the Canon of Scripture: I say the manner, for I have done little more than take the case of one of them for an example. It could not, indeed, be otherwise. The Fathers were living (those at least whom I am particularly contemplating), whilst the Canon was in the act of formation—witnesses, perhaps agents in the process. The hand-writing of St. Paul, for instance, was probably still known and preserved. He had himself expressly drawn attention to it, as a pledge of the authenticity of the documents that presented it. "The salutation of Paul," says he in his second Epistle to the Thessalonians,[8] "with mine own hand (τῇ ἐμῇ χειρὶ), which is the token (σημεῖον) in every Epistle"—a notice, it may be observed, which when dropped in this place supplies an undesigned coincidence; for in an earlier part of the same Epistle St. Paul had been cautioning the Thessalonians against a fictitious letter circulated as from him.[9] This familiar signature then authenticated the Epistles

[1] Pædag. II. c. vii. p. 203.

[2] Ἐν τῇ μείζονι ἐπιστολῇ.—Stromat. II. § xv. p. 464.

[3] Origen, De Principiis, III. c. i. § 16; IV. § 1.

[4] De Principiis, IV. §§ 9, 10.

[5] Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 25.

[6] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. viii. p. 280; Stromat. III. § ii. p. 515.

[7] Tertullian, De Cultu Fœminarum, I. c. iii.

[8] 2 Thess. iii. 17. [9] ii. 2.

at the first; and whether the original manuscripts had survived to the times of the Fathers, or not, the traditional value of it must have reached them. But many understand the expression of Tertullian, when speaking of the Epistles which subsisted in the Apostolical Churches to which they were severally addressed, "ipsæ authenticæ litteræ," of the autographs of the Apostles.[1] Dodwell so understood it; and is evidently under the impression that no other sense could be put on it.[2] Bishop Kaye, however, leans to the notion that nothing more was here meant than the genuine unadulterated Epistles[3]; and he produces a passage from the "De Monogamiâ"[4] of Tertullian, where the term "in Græco authentico" simply means in the original Greek, as contradistinguished from a translation; and other passages in the same author where "originalia instrumenta Christi," "originale instrumentum Moysi"[5] merely signify the Gospels and the Pentateuch, as they were originally written, not the autographs. Still Bishop Kaye may be thought not to have taken sufficiently into account the force of the word "ipsæ" in the paragraph in question, for the emphasis does not rest on the word "authenticæ" altogether—"*ipsæ* authenticæ litteræ" certainly seeming to point to something more than correct copies—and undoubtedly in Cyprian, whose Latin bears resemblance to Tertullian's, and who, as we learn from Jerome, was a constant reader of him,[6] I have met with a passage where the term "authentica epistola" is used to express the *autograph* of the writer. Cyprian is replying to the Presbyters and Deacons of Rome who had sent him a letter informing him of the death of the Bishop of Rome. "I have read also other letters," says he, not, however, clearly expressing who wrote them or to whom they are written. "And since in these same letters" (*i. e.* both that which he had received from the Priests and Deacons, and these which had reached him from other quarters) "both the writing, the sense, and the

[1] Percurre ecclesias apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsident; apud quas ipsæ authenticæ litteræ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem et repræsentantes faciem unius cujusque.—De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxxvi.

[2] Dissert. in Irenæum, I. § xli. p. 74.

[3] Bishop Kaye on Tertullian, p. 293, 3rd Ed.; Porson's Letters to Travis, pp. 276–7. See some remarks on the same side in Hug's Introduction, vol. i. p. 105, in Mr. Wait's translation.

[4] Tertullian, De Monogamiâ, c. xi.

[5] De Carne Christi, c. ii.; Adv. Hermogenem, c. xix.

[6] See Porson's Letters to Travis, pp. 262–3.

very paper have made me anxious to ascertain that nothing has been added to the truth, or diminished therefrom, I have sent back the same original letter (eandem authenticam epistolam) to you, that you may know whether it is that very one which you gave to Crementius the Subdeacon to bear. For it is a very grave matter, if the truth of a clerical epistle be corrupted by any lie or fraud. In order, therefore, to satisfy us, see whether the writing and subscription be yours, and write us word back what is the fact."[1] The meaning of the term "authentica" therefore here is indisputable; and therefore there is nothing in the *Latin* of Tertullian which should deter us from understanding that the autographs of the Apostles were preserved in the Apostolic Churches in the days of Tertullian. And though the establishment of this fact is not *necessary* in order to give the testimony of the Fathers to the construction of the Canon authority and weight; for under any circumstances their date would give it them, if nothing else; still it is not to be denied, that such testimony would derive additional importance from any opportunity they might have of examining the manuscripts of the Apostles, or of conferring with others who had examined them.

Nor is this all. There are many difficulties and doubts which arise collaterally out of the subject of the Canon of Scripture, which are still to be resolved in a great measure by the same means, an appeal to the primitive Fathers.

For instance, it has been contended from an expression which occurs in 1 Cor. v. 9. "I wrote unto you in an epistle" (such is our translation, ἔγραψα ὑμῖν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ, in the Greek), that an Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians must have been lost, and that to this lost Epistle it is that reference is here made. Bishop Middleton, however, contends[2] that the translation should be, "I write unto you in my epistle," *i. e.* in the Epistle then under his hand; and that there is no allusion in the passage to any other Epistle. For this rendering he gives grammatical and philological reasons, and these are confirmed and supported by Professor Scholefield.[3] But independently of these, how strong is the external evidence, even if we rest that evidence on Irenæus alone, that

[1] Cyprian, Ep. iii.

[2] On the Greek Article, note on 1 Cor. v. 9.

[3] Hints for an Improved Translation, p. 56.

no Epistle of St. Paul's to the Corinthians can be missing! For it is scarcely possible to imagine that he should have quoted the first and second Epistles to the Corinthians so largely as he does, and yet should not have made the slightest reference to another of his Epistles, written to the same Church, prior to these, had any existed in his time, or at least had he ever heard of any other; especially as he lays under contribution *every* other Epistle to a Church according to our Canon, which St. Paul wrote, as well as the two to the Corinthians.

Again, it is well known that another question has been agitated relating to one of the Epistles of St. Paul, viz. whether the Epistle to the Ephesians is properly so entitled —whether the Epistle which we call that to the Ephesians is not in fact an Epistle to the Laodiceans; the same to which allusion is made in Col. iv. 16, "Cause . . . . that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea;" as if St. Paul had said, "Cause the epistle, which I sent to Laodicea with directions that it should be forwarded to Colossæ, to be read in your congregation at Colossæ." But it is plain that Irenæus has no such understanding of the passage; but only knows of an Epistle to the Ephesians, whilst his quotations from it plainly identify it with our own of the same title. Still less does he afford any ground for the notion that a distinct Epistle to the Laodiceans ever existed, which has since disappeared. For copious as are his extracts from the various writings of St. Paul, his very plan, as I shall show presently, leading him to overlook none of them, there is not one that is not to be found in our present copies of them. And in another of the Fathers, Tertullian, we have more than negative evidence upon this question: for in his treatise against Marcion, in the fifth book of it,[1] in which he is refuting that heretic out of the Epistles of St. Paul, on arriving at the Epistle to the Ephesians, he observes, "We now come to yet another Epistle, which we entitle the Epistle to the Ephesians, but *the heretics entitled it, to the Laodiceans.*" And he afterwards adds,[2] that it was Marcion's pleasure to change the title of this Epistle, as a proof of his own profound in-

[1] Adv. Marcionem, V. c. xi.

[2] Ecclesiæ quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam, non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator.—c. xvii.

vestigation of the subject. With respect to the text, therefore, in the Epistle to the Colossians, which gave occasion to the doubt we are now discussing, we may be disposed to conclude with Bishop Middleton,[1] that nothing is more probable than Macknight's conjecture, viz. that the Apostle sent the Ephesians word by Tychicus, who carried their letter, to send a copy of it to the Laodiceans, with an order to them to communicate it to the Colossians. "This hypothesis," continues the Bishop, "will account for the want of those marks of personal acquaintance which the Apostle's former residence at Ephesus might lead us to expect; for everything *local* would be purposely omitted in an Epistle which had a further destination"—a difficulty which had induced Dr. Paley, in his "Horæ Paulinæ," to adopt the theory of our Epistle to the Ephesians being, in fact, the Epistle to the Laodiceans. So important is the testimony of a Father in such a controversy as this about the Canon.

I do not say that questions of this kind, arising out of the Canon, can always be *settled* by the simple authority of the Fathers; but I do say that by rejecting all help from that quarter, we are depriving ourselves of one very important means of settling them.

Again, we are all aware that the Epistle to the Hebrews has been a very fruitful subject of controversy; who was its author, and what its authority? No doubt many ingredients will enter into this discussion besides patristical evidence; but it is obvious that if the discussion be conducted to the exclusion of that evidence, there will be infinite difficulty in coming to any result. The repeated reference to the Epistle to the Hebrews, though not by name, in the Epistle of Clemens, marks at least its very early circulation, and the weight attached to it. It is true that the absence of the ordinary salutation with which all St. Paul's other Epistles begin, may have caused its establishment in the Canon to be more tardy; especially when to this circumstance we add, that being addressed to no particular Church, the original copy would not be necessarily kept in the archives of that Church, or be publicly read in any, at least as having a local interest. But Clemens Alexandrinus in his Hypotyposes, as Eusebius informs us,[2] assigns a very probable reason for this omission

[1] On the Greek Article, note on Ephes. i. 1.

[2] Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 14.

of the salutation; viz. that as Paul wrote it to the Hebrews who had contracted prejudices against him, and held him in suspicion, he prudently avoided revolting them by putting his name at the beginning. Under these circumstances it might well enough be ascribed by Tertullian,[1] yet uncertain about its author, to Barnabas; and (as though the Church of Carthage was less informed on the subject than other Churches) it might not be once quoted by Cyprian, who nevertheless quotes all the other Epistles of St. Paul, except the short one to Philemon. Still, as time advanced, and gave opportunity for further investigation of its claims, the ascription of it to St. Paul, we find (but still we find it from the testimony of the Fathers), became more positive; so that Clemens Alexandrinus, in his Stromata, cites it not only as St. Paul's, but in such a manner as to imply that the Church of his day fully acquiesced in that judgment. For says he, "'Faith is the substance of things hoped for, the evidence of things not seen,'[2] according to the Divine Apostle,"[3] as though the author of the passage was perfectly known, and as though there was no need to name St. Paul. For of St. Paul he was thinking beyond a doubt, since, in another place, after adverting to a paragraph in the Epistle to the Hebrews beginning,[4] "And we desire that every one of you do show the same diligence to the full assurance of hope," and ending,[5] "made an high-priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek," he adds, "And the book of Proverbs speaks in language similar to that of Paul"[6]; evidently implying that Paul was the author of the passage from the Epistle to the Hebrews he had just been quoting. An intimation of this kind is more than an assertion, and betrays that on Clemens' mind there was no question about the writer.

Again, we find Origen, in his Epistle to Africanus, quoting the Epistle to the Hebrews,[7] "they were stoned, they were *sawn asunder*, . . . were slain with the sword," in proof of Isaiah having suffered by the saw; to which circumstance, says he, reference is made in this verse; though possibly, he then adds, the Jews (who were interested in suppressing a fact disgraceful to themselves) might here demur to the autho-

[1] De Pudicitiâ, c. xx.
[2] Heb. xi. 1.
[3] Stromat. II. § ii. pp. 432–3.
[4] Heb. vi. 11.
[5] vi. 20.
[6] Stromat. II. § xxii. p. 501.
[7] Heb. xi. 37.

rity, "availing themselves of the decision of those who reject this Epistle, *as one which was not written by Paul.* However, as this objection," continues Origen, "requires of me a distinct argument in order to demonstrate that Paul's it is (*εἰς ἀπόδειξιν τοῦ εἶναι Παύλου τὴν ἐπιστολήν*), I will proceed, for the present, to another authority, that of Jesus Christ himself, as witnessed in the Gospel."[1] Origen's own judgment would seem here to be clear that it was Paul's. However, in a paragraph of his Homilies on the Epistle to the Hebrews, preserved by Eusebius,[2] for the Homilies themselves are lost, he expresses himself to this effect, "that the thoughts are the Apostle's, but the phraseology rather that of one who had noted down at his leisure what the Apostle had said"—and then he concludes as follows—"If, then, any Church holds this Epistle to be Paul's, let it be commended for so doing; for the men of old time have not delivered it down to us as his without a reason for it. Who, however, did write the Epistle, truly God knows. The history which has reached us is, according to some, that Clemens, Bishop of Rome, wrote it; according to others, Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts." There may seem to be some difference in the tenour of these two passages of Origen; the former more decided than the latter in favour of Paul's being the sole author of the Epistle. Which of the two is the later in date, and consequently the passage which conveys Origen's maturer judgment (often a matter of importance to establish, where we are dealing with his writings), I am not able to say. But in his treatise against Celsus, probably one of his latest (indeed he frequently refers in it to other of his writings), and certainly one of the soberest, and best advised, and most valuable of all his works, he quotes the Epistle to the Hebrews as St. Paul's without the least symptom of hesitation; indeed, on the contrary, in a manner which satisfies us that it was the habitual feeling of his mind; for having had occasion to cite a passage from St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, he goes on to confirm that text by a second to the same effect from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which he introduces with this preface, "and the same Apostle . . . . . says" (*ὁ δ' αὐτὸς . . . . . φησί*),[3] thus incidentally be-

[1] Origen, Epist. ad Africanum, vol. i. p. 20.

[2] Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 25.

[3] Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 53.

traying, as we have seen Clemens doing before him, that he regarded the Epistle to the Corinthians, and that to the Hebrews, as by the same author, and that author Paul, for he actually names him. And in his treatise "De Principiis," which also appears to have been one of his later works,[1] he again alludes to the Epistle to the Hebrews in a way which would lead us to the conclusion that he then entertained no doubt about the author, simply saying, "the Apostle in the Epistle to the Hebrews;"[2] as if it was unnecessary to name him; and which accordingly Rufinus actually renders, "in epistolâ ad Hebræos Apostolus Paulus;" as he also makes Origen in another place, where the Greek, however, is lost, ascribe the same Epistle expressly to that Apostle[3]; and in another[4] yet more casually, and therefore more satisfactorily, Origen, according to him, refers to this Epistle, saying, "And John declares that God is light, and Paul intimates that the Son is the brightness of the eternal light."[5] But indeed, in Book IV. § 13, we have the Greek itself as a voucher to the same fact.

Moreover, Eusebius himself, who must have been aware of the whole controversy, and in a position to review all the facts which bore upon it, uses an expression which appears to convey, that by his time it had subsided into a general acquiescence in the Epistle being the work of St. Paul. "There hath also come down to us," says he, "a disputation of Gaius, a very eloquent man, held at Rome in the time of Zephyrinus against Proclus, who contended for the Cataphrygian heresy, in which, whilst rebuking the temerity and audacity of his adversaries in composing new Scriptures, he makes mention of only thirteen Epistles of the holy Apostles,

[1] From De Principiis, I. c. ii. § 6, it should seem according to Rufinus to have been written *before* his Commentary on Genesis, "De quo diligentius, favente Deo, *cum locum ipsum in Genesi exponere cœperimus, videbimus.*" Yet from I. c. iii. § 3, it would appear to have been written after it, "Spiritus igitur Dei qui super aquas ferebatur, sicut scriptum est in principio facturæ mundi, puto quod non sit alius quam Spiritus Sanctus, secundum quod ego intelligere possum, *sicut et cum ipsa loca exponeremus ostendimus;*" and still more from II. c. iii. § 6, "verum de hujuscemodi opinionibus plenius in illo loco *tractavimus*, cum requireremus quid esset quod in principio fecit Deus cœlum et terram:" so that Rufinus probably mistranslated the first passage. Moreover in II. c. x. § 1, Origen refers to other publications which had preceded the De Principiis, "de quo in aliis quidem libris, quos de Resurrectione scripsimus, plenius disputavimus."

[2] De Principiis, III. c. i. § 10.

[3] Præf. lib. I. § 1.

[4] IV. § 28.

[5] Heb. i. 2.

not counting that to the Hebrews with the rest; And even to this day," continues Eusebius, "among certain Romans (*παρὰ Ῥωμαίων τισὶν*), it is not thought to be that Apostle's;"[1] a form of expression which evidently leads us to conclude that there were few who did not then believe it to be St. Paul's. But there is a further circumstance to be remarked in this paragraph of Eusebius. The party who is here represented as omitting the Epistle to the Hebrews from the list of St. Paul's Epistles is a man who was engaged in controversy against the Montanists. Now the Montanists defended their dogma, that persons who had been guilty of great crimes were not to be readmitted into the Church, by a passage in the Epistle to the Hebrews,[2] "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, ... if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance," their chief argument; and this, perhaps, may in some degree account for even orthodox Churchmen, whose lot it was to be brought often into conflict with these heretics, being less anxious than they would otherwise have been to acknowledge this Epistle as Canonical.

Enough, therefore, I trust, has been said, to show that it is impossible to settle the question of the authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews (so far as it admits of being settled), without careful reference to *external* evidence, such as this which I have been adducing, as bearing upon it; whatever may be the internal. So much for the *Canon*.

Then with regard to the *substance* of the Canonical books, and the proof that it was in the earliest times what it is now —a very weighty question—where are you to turn for evidence of it, but to the Fathers, and what can be more satisfactory than the result? Thus, for the identity of our Gospels with those of the first centuries, who can dispute it, who looks at such facts as the following? When Irenæus is demonstrating how entirely the Gospel of Mark upheld the doctrine of the unity of God, he quotes three verses as the beginning "initium" of that Gospel—they *are* the beginning of our own; and one verse as at the end, "in fine"—it *is* the penultimate verse of our own.[3] And more fully yet he speaks of the *four* forms of the Cherubim—the lion, "giving

[1] Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 20.
[2] Heb. vi. 4. 6.
[3] Irenæus, III. c. x. § 6.

token of the active, directive, and regal character of him who sitteth on the Cherubim; the calf, of his priestly and sacrificial office; the man, of his incarnate presence; the eagle, of his spirit rushing upon the Church—forms characteristic of the four Gospels; that of St. John, which relates his princely and glorious generation, saying, 'In the beginning was the Word' . . . that of St. Luke, his sacerdotal office, commencing with Zacharias the priest, and his sacrifice . . . that of St. Matthew, teaching his birth as a *man*, and saying, 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ,' . . . that of St. Mark, opening with the announcement of the prophetical Spirit coming upon man from above, 'The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, as it is written' in Isaiah the prophet."[1] The entire correspondence of these headings of the several Gospels according to Irenæus with those of our own is obvious.

Again, when refuting the Gnostic opinion that Jesus preached but one year after his Baptism, Irenæus investigates the number of Passovers he attended, as he could gather his facts from the Gospel of St. John, after this manner. "After having made the water wine, he went up to a Passover[2] . . . After his conversation with the woman of Samaria, and the cure of the Centurion's son, he went up to another Passover, and healed the paralytic at the pool[3] . . . 'Six days before a Passover he came to Bethany'[4]; then went up to Jerusalem to eat the Passover; and the day following suffered."[5] Now all these facts here enumerated as marking the several journeys of our Lord, as occurring before and after them, precisely agree with the particulars in our own Gospel of St. John.

So again, when he is exposing the abuse of certain texts of Scripture by the Gnostics to the support of certain theories of their own respecting the number of their Æons, or of the combinations of their Æons, such as 12, 30, &c., he asks them why they do not deal with the number 5, *e. g.* in the same manner; for though that number does not enter into their system of Æons, it occurs just as frequently in Scripture as other numbers. He then proceeds to give proof of this. Thus the Lord took five loaves, fed five thousand men, had five persons with him at his transfiguration, was the fifth person

[1] Irenæus, III. c. xi. § 8.
[2] John ii. 13. 23.
[3] iv. 7, *et seq.*; iv. 46, *et seq.*; v. 1.
[4] xii. 1.
[5] Irenæus, II. c. xxii. § 3.

present at the raising of the girl from the dead; then the rich man in hell had five brethren; the pool had five porches[1]; all of them incidents in perfect accordance with those of our own Gospels, except in the single instance of the number of persons present at the raising of the maiden,[2] where, probably by lapse of memory, he seems to have overlooked John, for he omits his name in the quotation of St. Luke, as by a similar lapse Origen affirms that Jesus is nowhere called in the Gospels received by the Churches the carpenter (τέκτων[3]), though the evidence is overwhelming that our Gospels were his; still the substantial fact is agreeable to our own record of it. There is another passage in the same author so very decisive of the question before us, that I cannot forbear producing it. The heretics, against whom he was contending, were playing fast and loose, it appears, with the authority of the Gospel of St. Luke; rejecting it in part, and yet building on it as a whole. To these, he remarks, that they must either do one thing or the other; either accept or discard it altogether; and in the latter case they must be content to forego the knowledge of a great many incidents which are related by St. Luke exclusively. He then goes on to enumerate these incidents, as the generation of John, the history of Zacharias, the visitation of the angel to Mary, and the exclamation of Elizabeth, the descent of the angels to the shepherds, and the salutation they uttered; the testimony of Anna, and of Simeon, to Christ; the fact of Jesus being left behind at Jerusalem when twelve years old; John's baptism, and at what age our Lord was baptized, and that it was the fifteenth year of Tiberius; and his denunciation of woe to the rich, and the miracles of the fishes which Peter and his companions caught, and many more circumstances; for he goes through the whole Gospel of St. Luke, detaching from it the incidents which belonged peculiarly to that Evangelist.[4] Now what an invaluable testimony have we here to the substance of the Gospels being the same now that it was in the days of Irenæus! For the passage points out to us not merely what was recorded by one of the Evangelists, but what was omitted by the other three; and we find both the conditions

[1] Irenæus, II. c. xxiv. § 4.
[2] Luke viii. 51.
[3] Origen, Contra Celsum, VI. § 36. See Mark vi. 3.
[4] Irenæus, III. c. xiv. § 3.

fulfilled in every particular by the Gospels we at present possess.

Or if you turn to Justin Martyr, you will discover in him also similar incidental evidence of the substantial identity of the Gospels with which he was acquainted, and those with which we are. This appears, indeed, throughout his works; but more especially in his long comment on the 22nd Psalm, which occurs in his Dialogue with Trypho,[1] where, whilst pressing the Jew with the peculiar aptness of the details of that Psalm to the events of our Lord's life, death, resurrection and return to his disciples, he reviews to a very great extent indeed the scenes described in the Gospels, so as to leave no reasonable doubt on the mind of any man, that the documents from which he draws his knowledge of these incidents are the same as those which furnish it to ourselves. Nay, more, a passage in Origen would lead us to infer, that he knew of no authentic sources of information whatever respecting Jesus except the Gospels, our own Gospels. Celsus (or the Jew in whose person he here speaks) had been vapouring "that he had many things to tell of Jesus, and true things too, though not like those which had been committed to writing by his disciples; which, however, he would not trouble himself to produce. What, then, may these true things be," replies Origen, "which are not like those written in the Gospels, and which Celsus's Jew will pass over? Are we to suppose," he then adds, "that he makes use of a rhetorical figure of speech, and only pretends that he has something to tell; having all the while nothing to produce which is not in the Gospels, that could strike any reader as true, or as conveying any charge against Jesus or his doctrine?"[2] So much for the Gospels.

In like manner, and from the like authorities, we can prove the substance of the Acts of the Apostles to be now what it was in the second century. For here again we have Irenæus, whilst pursuing his argument in demonstration of there being no other God besides God the Father, nor any other Christ besides Jesus who died and rose again, and whom the prophets foretold; in opposition to the Gnostics who held a primeval God distinct from the Creator, and a Jesus who suffered, and a Christ who escaped from the

[1] §§ 98–106.

[2] Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 13.

Passion—we have Irenæus, I say, refuting these notions by a series of appeals to the Acts of the Apostles; to the scene of the election of Matthias in the first chapter; to St. Peter's speech in the second chapter; to the cure of the impotent man by Peter and John in the third chapter with all the circumstances of it; to the cry of exultation of all the brethren, when, in consequence of this miracle, they lifted up their voice to God with one accord and said, "Lord, thou art God," &c., in the fourth chapter; and so on,[1] the quotations too, often extending to half a chapter at a time.

The identity of the substance of the present Epistles with that of those bearing the same name in the Primitive Church, admits of proof of the same kind more or less copious. For you will bear in mind that the task which Irenæus imposes on himself in his fifth book is this: after having refuted the heretics by authorities drawn from other quarters, to do it now by portions of our Lord's own teaching, which he had not as yet touched, and by the Apostolical Epistles "ex reliquis doctrinæ Domini nostri et ex apostolicis epistolis conabimur ostensiones facere:"[2] so that his subject led him to range largely over those Epistles, and lay them liberally under contribution. And this circumstance accounts, as well for the very full testimony he supplies on the question of the Canon of Scripture, as on that other question, no less important, with which we are now engaged, the identity of the substance of the Epistles we at present possess, with that of those familiar to this Father.

The controversies of those days place us exactly in the same advantageous position for drawing information on this subject from Tertullian. For besides his innumerable references to the Epistles, throughout his writings in general, in his fifth book against Marcion he conducts his argument upon precisely the same principle as Irenæus in *his* fifth book against the Gnostics in general; viz. on the principle of proving his case out of the Epistles of St. Paul. He will show that "as Christ himself had made no such revelation respecting God as Marcion contended for, there was the more need it should be made by that Apostle; and he had arranged his reasonings in the order he had done, for the purpose of demonstrating, that as no other God besides the

[1] Irenæus, III. c. xii. [2] V. Præf.

Creator had been set forth by Christ, so had none other been set forth by the Apostle; as will appear," says he, "from the Epistles themselves of Paul; which however, like the Gospel, had been mutilated by the heretics, because they were perceived to be against them."[1] Here, therefore, as before, the very plan of the argument of the Father developes, not the Canon only of the Epistles, but the substance of them, which is what we are now considering; proving to a demonstration, and by quotations so ample and so numerous, that it is out of the question to recite them, the substance of the Epistles known to us, to be the substance of the Epistles known to Tertullian.

Before I make an end, I cannot forbear once more drawing your attention to the folly of those, for I can call it by no gentler term, who would drive the Fathers out of the field of ecclesiastical literature, and regard all such as take an interest in them with suspicion; pregnant as you see they are with conclusions of such enormous importance as those which I have been deducing from them to-day.

[1] Sive nihil tale de Deo Christus revelaverat, tanto magis ab apostolo debuerat revelari, qui jam non posset ab alio; non credendus sine dubio, si nec ab apostolo revelatus. Quod idcirco præstruximus, ut jam hinc profiteamur nos proinde probaturos, nullum alium Deum ab apostolo circumlatum, sicut probavimus, nec a Christo; ex ipsis utique epistolis Pauli, quas proinde mutilatas etiam de numero, forma jam hæretici Evangelii præjudicasse debebit.—Adv. Marcionem, V. c. i.

LECTURE IX.

Use of the Fathers in ascertaining the *text* of the New Testament. Their motives for accuracy in this particular. Importance of their testimony in establishing the genuineness of whole passages. The impression produced by it increased, when the occasion of it is known. Its use further exemplified, where the genuineness of the passage is doubtful, as 1 John v. 7, and the subscription of the first Epistle to the Corinthians. The same testimony of still greater value in the criticism of single words; opposed to the reading of Griesbach and Wetstein in Acts xx. 28, and to that of the "Improved Version" in Rom. ix. 5. Some other examples.

THE next advantage which I said resulted from the testimony of the Fathers, was the light they throw on the *text of Scripture*. It must be so with writers who lived at so very early a date, whose works are filled with quotations from the books of the New Testament, and with dissertations on the meaning, and who were under the strongest impressions of the grievous sin there was in taking any liberty with the sacred text.[1] Neither was it enough for them to have a *general* acquaintance with Holy Writ: the various forms of heresy, with which they had to contend, exacting more from them than this. Many of the heretics mutilated Scripture to serve their purposes; it was the more necessary, therefore, that they should be prepared with the genuine text. Many misinterpreted and perverted it; it was required of them, therefore, to wrest the passages thus distorted from their hands, on which occasions the disputes would sometimes turn on so small a matter as the position of a point. A *particular* knowledge, therefore, of Scripture was absolutely demanded of the champions of orthodoxy and the Church: and I think we must be often struck, especially when reading the works of the early Fathers, with the microscopic eye, which they

[1] See Irenæus, V. c. xxx. § 1. Ἔπειτα δὲ τοῦ προσθέντος, ἢ ἀφελόντος τι τῆς γραφῆς, ἐπιτιμίαν οὐ τὴν τυχοῦσαν ἔχοντος, εἰς αὐτὴν ἐμπεσεῖν ἀνάγκη τὸν τοιοῦτον. Where it may be remarked, the observation is called forth by a question respecting a text in the *New* Testament and not the Old; the number of the beast in the Revelation, ch. xiii. 18.

cast on Scripture, and the conclusions—the fair conclusions—they frequently extract from texts, which would not have suggested themselves to listless or superficial readers.

In treating of the subject before us, I am only overwhelmed by the mass of matter proper to illustrate it, which lies at the command of any man even moderately informed in these early authors. I will, however, endeavour to lay before you some examples of the use of the Fathers in this particular, not, perhaps, the best that might be furnished—for the best will not always come at one's call; and one often has to regret, after having delivered a Lecture, that such and such passages to the purpose did not present themselves at the time of composing it—but at all events examples sufficiently in point to establish the proposition before us, and to increase your respect for the study of authors so conducive to the most important interests of sound theology. Our own sense, indeed, would dictate to us that such use as I am now drawing from the Fathers must naturally belong to them, and some may think that it is superfluous to enter into details in a case so clear; but that sort of general acquiescence in a truth is a very different thing from a conviction of it wrought by the effect of specific illustrations in point, and with these present in our minds we become far more able to contend with gainsayers.

Now in the first place, *whole passages* of the New Testament have been objected against as spurious or of doubtful authority by persons who would understand the Scriptures in a sense of their own, and in no other, and who were, therefore, under a temptation to decry portions of it which stood in the way of their theory. For instance, modern Unitarians have called in question large portions of the two first chapters of the Gospel of St. Matthew.[1] The "Improved Version" of the New Testament pronounces it impossible that the genealogy and the history which follows the genealogy, and extends to the end of the second chapter, and which contains an account of the miraculous conception, could have been written by the same author.[2] Certainly it would be enough to reply, as it may be replied with truth, that the manuscripts are altogether against them. But two witnesses are better than

[1] Bloomfield's Greek Testament, vol. i. p. 3.

[2] The New Testament in an Improved Version, p. 1, 4th Ed.

one nevertheless, and it is satisfactory to be able to confirm the manuscripts by the testimony of the Fathers, who lived almost as early as when manuscripts of the New Testament began to have any existence—especially as such testimony is of a popular character, more readily remembered, and more easily appreciated, than the number and value of the manuscripts. Such a Father is Irenæus; fortunately, providentially we may say, he was engaged in controversy with parties whose faith was unsound as to the nature of Jesus Christ: not that they denied or doubted the Divinity of Christ (with the exception of a small and inconsiderable sect of heretics [1]); but instead of believing that "Though he be God and Man, yet he is not two, but one Christ," maintained that Jesus and Christ were separate beings, Christ descending upon Jesus at his baptism and quitting him before his crucifixion. In refuting this absurd notion, Irenæus appeals, amongst other proofs, to the whole of the first chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew, both to the genealogy and to the history of the miraculous conception which follows it, and evidently without the least suspicion that its genuineness could be disputed. "I have already sufficiently proved," says he, "from the language of John, that he understood the Word of God to be one and the same, to be the Only Begotten; to be the same who took flesh for our salvation, even Jesus Christ our Lord. However, Matthew knowing that Jesus is one and the same, when setting forth his human generation of a virgin (even as God promised David, that of the fruit of his body he would raise up an everlasting king; and again, long before, gave the same promise to Abraham), saith, 'The book of the generation of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham;' afterwards, in order, to set our minds free from all suspicion about Joseph he saith, 'Now the birth of Christ was on this wise; when as his mother was espoused unto Joseph, before they came together, she was found to be with child of the Holy Ghost;' afterwards, when Joseph was thinking of putting Mary away because she was pregnant, an angel of God appeared unto him and said, 'Fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife, for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost; and she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.

[1] Τινές.—Justin Martyr, Dial. § 48.

Now all this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the Prophet, Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which is, God with us ;' manifestly signifying," continues Irenæus, "that the promise which had been made to the Fathers had been fulfilled, that the Son of God had been born of a virgin, and that this same was the Saviour Christ, whom the prophets foretold; not, as *they* say, that Jesus was he who was born of Mary, but Christ, he who descended upon him. For whereas Matthew might have written, 'The birth of *Jesus* was on this wise,' the Holy Ghost, foreseeing corrupters (of the truth), and providing against their artifice, says, by Matthew, 'Now the birth of *Christ* was on this wise,'" (Irenæus reading Χριστοῦ and not Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ,) "and says, too, that this is Emmanuel, lest perchance we should suppose him to be only a man . . . and in order that we should not suspect Jesus to be one person and Christ another, but be assured that they were one and the same."[1]

Who can read this passage and entertain a doubt that Irenæus had no misgiving whatever respecting the genuineness of the first chapter of St. Matthew; that he felt in using it he was building his argument against the Valentinians on a foundation that could not be shaken? And who can help being struck with the thought that these imaginations of the heretics of the first and second centuries, wild and baseless as they seem, so wild and so baseless that we wonder they should have called up such a patient antagonist as Irenæus, were just the very crotchets which were calculated to cause him and others, in refuting them, to put their testimony on record to portions of Scripture, which have the nature of Jesus Christ for their subject; passages on that very account of infinite value, and worthy of every guarantee that could be devised for their authority, and thus to preserve to the end of time weapons of war against any Anti-Christian heresy which, in the lapse of ages, might discover itself.

Clemens Alexandrinus affords us similar evidence, and of the same incidental character as the last, to the genuineness of the first chapter of St. Matthew. Indeed, all the evidence these very early Fathers furnish on these most interesting

[1] Irenæus, III. c. xvi. § 2.

topics is incidental, and on that very account is the more precious; for they are pursuing other inquiries of their own—inquiries for the most part of little concern to us—when the information of which we are in search escapes them by the way. Clemens, I say, is engaged in a very copious and favourite argument of his, that of proving that all heathen literature is long subsequent to Jewish. In the course of it he gathers some dates which answer his purpose from Josephus, which show that from Moses to the tenth of Antoninus were 1933 years, so far back was the Law given. "Others," he proceeds, "reckoning from Inachus and Moses to the death of Commodus, say that there were 2942 years; others, again, 2821. But in the Gospel according to Matthew," he continues, which is the passage I am submitting to your attention, "the genealogy is carried on from Abraham to Mary the mother of our Lord. For from Abraham to David, it says, are fourteen generations; and from David until the carrying away into Babylon, fourteen generations; and from the carrying away into Babylon unto Christ are fourteen generations; —three mystical intervals completed in six weeks."[1] And though the argument of Clemens does not lead him *in this place* to quote the first chapter of St. Matthew further than the genealogy, he elsewhere acknowledges the fact of the miraculous conception, the stumbling-block of the "Improved Version," saying, for instance, "That the Word proceeding (προελθὼν) was the author of Creation; for when the Word took flesh in order that he might be visible, he *begat himself*."[2] I have given the argument on which Clemens is employed, and the paragraph itself at full, in order that you may see the better the entire assumption there is on the part of Clemens, though impressed with the truth of the miraculous conception, that this genealogy cannot be gainsaid; the utter absence of all suspicion from his mind that the genuineness of it can be questioned. Much of the force of the evidence would be lost, did I content myself with this single assertion, that Clemens evidently regards the first chapter of St. Matthew as genuine. You want the setting in order to do the jewel justice. I fear my Lectures are sometimes protracted by these amplifications; but I presume that there are some here to whom these investigations are new, and I know I can reckon

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § xxi. p. 409.

[2] V. § iii. p. 654.

on the forbearance of those whose knowledge is more mature, whilst I amplify for a good purpose.

Nor is this all. The "Improved Version" further reminds its readers that Archbishop Newcome, whose translation is taken for the basis of that version, suspects the seventeenth verse of the first chapter of St. Matthew[1] to be a marginal note anciently taken into the text; but we see Clemens in this place not only quoting this verse, but actually discovering in it a mystical meeting. And Origen, it may be added, on one occasion without quoting, evidently in a loose manner refers to the verse[2]; and on another represents Celsus as founding one of his infidel arguments on the Saviour's genealogy as given in the Evangelists, and in replying to him, so far is he from intimating that the genealogies are spurious, that he actually retorts upon him that he was not even intimately acquainted with the argument he was handling; for that had he been he would have known, which it seemed he did not, that the Christians themselves had found a difficulty and a subject of investigation in the *discrepancy* of the genealogies; thus clearly suggesting to us that the genealogies both of St. Matthew and St. Luke were in his days what they are in ours, and were undisputed passages of the New Testament, both of them.[3]

Again, I observe it stated[4] that some modern Germans pronounce, in the same spirit of rash and presumptuous conjecture which dictated the last objection, the passage in the twenty-seventh chapter of St. Matthew,[5] where it is said, "The graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints which slept arose and came out of the graves," &c.—an incident not mentioned by any other of the Evangelists—to be spurious. Here, again, it might be enough to reply, that the manuscripts are all against them. But still it is satisfactory to know, that so early as Ignatius there is allusion made to the fact, though not a quotation of the words, the allusion, perhaps, carrying even more conviction to the mind that the verse existed in the copy of St. Matthew's Gospel which was in the hands of Ignatius, than the insertion of the text itself would have done. "How shall we be able to live without

[1] "So all the generations from Abraham to David are fourteen generations," &c.

[2] Origen, Contra Celsum, VI. § 5.

[3] II. § 32.

[4] See Bloomfield's Edition of the Greek Testament, *in loc.*

[5] vv. 52, 53.

him?" writes he to the Magnesians, "whose disciples the very prophets were, and whom by the Spirit they expected as their teacher; and therefore he, whom they righteously waited for, being come, *raised them up from the dead.*"[1]

Thus will the Fathers often supply a ready and intelligible answer to rash charges indeed, thrown out against the received text of Scripture, but such charges nevertheless as it is desirable to meet and silence.

Again, they will be equally important in the investigation of passages of doubtful character. How greatly is their testimony concerned, for instance, in determining the genuineness of 1 John v. 7. I am not of course, about to embark upon this elaborate controversy, a portion of which has nothing to do with the subject now before us, which is to show the value of the *Fathers* in determining the text of Scripture: though, indeed, this case of the disputed verse pretty much resolves itself eventually into a scrutiny of two passages of the Fathers, one in Tertullian, and the other in Cyprian. Annihilate these, and the support of the verse from other quarters greatly fails: on the other hand, prove that they certainly contemplate the verse, and in spite of the argument from the manuscripts there would have been great difficulty in rejecting a passage which could be vindicated by testimony so early. Show that the *resemblance* to the verse certainly discoverable in those two passages can be accounted for without supposing Tertullian and Cyprian to have seen it, and the probability of its spuriousness will augment in proportion to the success with which that proposition is made out. This is the passage in Tertullian: "Cæterum, de meo sumet, inquit; sicut ipse de Patris. Ita connexus Patris in Filio, et Filii in Paracleto, tres efficit cohærentes, alterum ex altero, qui tres unum sunt, non unus: quo modo *dictum est,* Ego et Pater unum sumus, ad substantiæ unitatem, non ad numeri singularitatem."[2] "He shall take, says the Son, of mine,[3] as I myself took of the Father's. Thus the connection of the Father in the Son, and of the Son in the Paraclete, makes three Persons cohering one with another, which three are one substance (unum), not one Person (unus), as it is written, 'I and my Father are one,'[4] *i. e.* as to unity of substance not as to

[1] Ignat. ad Magnes. § ix.
[2] Tertull. Adv. Praxeam, c. xxv.
[3] John xvi. 14.
[4] x. 30.

singularity of number." Here, says one party, in the expression, "tres unum sunt," you have a quotation from the disputed verse 1 John v. 7. No, replies the other, Tertullian does not mark it as a quotation, which, had it been one, he would have done; for he had done so just before, when he had quoted John xvi. 14, using an "inquit;" and again he does so just after, when he quotes John x. 30, using a "dictum est:" yet here he gives no intimation of the kind. Moreover, if the three heavenly witnesses were in Tertullian's copy, why does he content himself with so slight an allusion as this to a text so much to his purpose; so much more to his purpose than that of John x. 30, which he instantly after proceeds to cite? And how comes it, that in a treatise of some length, such as this against Praxeas is, and where the course of the argument is constantly forcing him upon this disputed text, he never advances it but in this one supposed case? The words "qui tres unum sunt," therefore, they maintain, are Tertullian's own; as if he had argued, "which three are one, *unum* I say, not *unus*; just as in St. John's Gospel we have, 'I and my Father are one,' where it is also unum; for it is meant unity of substance, not singularity of person."

The passage of Cyprian is in his "De Unitate Ecclesiæ,"[1] "Dicit Dominus, Ego et Pater unum sumus; et iterum de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto scriptum est, Et hi tres unum sunt." "The Lord says, I and my Father are one; and again concerning the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost it is written, And these three are one." Here once more the defenders of the verse contend, you have it quoted by Cyprian. No, rejoin their antagonists; it is only an application of his of the 8th verse, not a quotation of the 7th, a mystical application quite characteristic of him and of his school: just as Facundus, a Bishop of the African Church of the sixth century applies it, saying, "Joannes Apostolus in epistolâ suâ de Patre et Filio et Spiritu Sancto sic dixit, tres sunt, qui testimonium dant *in terrâ*,[2] spiritus, aqua, et sanguis, et hi tres unum sunt, in spiritu significans Patrem, in aquâ vero Spiritum Sanctum

[1] § vi.

[2] It may be said that "in terrâ" is in itself a part of the interpolated verse, which is from ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ to ἐν τῇ γῇ inclusive. But hear Professor Porson: "In Facundus, it is true, the editions six times repeat in terrâ; but these words are so inconsistent with the interpretation which Facundus is labouring to establish, that Bengelius

significans, in sanguine vero Filium significans."[1] "The Apostle John in his Epistle writes thus of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, 'There are three that bear witness in earth, the spirit, the water, and the blood, and these three are one;' by the spirit signifying the Father, by the water the Holy Ghost, and by the blood the Son"—a passage they further argue, which very strongly implies that Facundus at least knew nothing of the seventh verse; otherwise, why should he prove the point, which the seventh verse affirms in plain words, by a mystical interpretation of the eighth? Moreover, they add, Facundus confirms his own mystical interpretation of the eighth verse by an express appeal to Cyprian, as one who understood it in the same way as himself, and accordingly he quotes the paragraph in Cyprian from the "De Unitate Ecclesiæ" just brought before you; only he assigns it to a work of his "De Trinitate," whether by a mistake, or whether Cyprian had used it in both treatises, the latter of the two being now lost, a point at all events of no importance to the argument. This appeal to Cyprian by Facundus is a continuation of the foregoing passage, and is as follows, "which testimony of the Apostle John, Cyprian in an Epistle or book, which he wrote concerning the Trinity, understands to have been said of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for he says," &c.; and then comes the paragraph from Cyprian already given. This shows that Facundus knew nothing of the seventh verse, and that he supposed Cyprian's allusion to be to the eighth and not to the seventh. But how, rejoin the defenders of the verse, do you explain the term, "it is written," with which Cyprian ushers in the phrase, "And these three are one?"[2] Does not this prove that Cyprian at any rate considered it a quotation, and is not the sentence in fact found in the disputed verse? No doubt Cyprian considered it a quotation, is the reply, but the eighth verse supplies a similar phrase, *καὶ οἱ τρεῖς εἰς τὸ ἓν εἰσιν*, and is the one which Cyprian was thinking of and citing. And you will have the less difficulty in allowing this as Facundus, who unquestionably cites the

fairly allows them to have been added by transcribers. We ought also to consider that Facundus has been published from a single MS."—Letters to Travis, p. 386.

[1] Facundus, Pro Defensione Trium Capitulorum, I. c. iii.

[2] *Καὶ οὗτοι οἱ τρεῖς ἕν εἰσι.*

eighth verse and not the seventh, cites these words exactly as Cyprian does, "et hi tres unum sunt."

I shall not pursue this subject further, nor am I called upon to express any positive opinion on the disputed verse, whether it is genuine or not; but I say that the short statement I have made of a main feature of the controversy must suffice to satisfy you, that the Fathers have a great deal to do in determining it; and that he would be a strange critic of the New Testament who should undertake to fix the true text in this place, and banish the Fathers from all share in his reasoning.

Again, to take another case of a different kind; the date of the first Epistle to the Corinthians subscribed at the foot of it in our ordinary copies runs thus: "The First Epistle to the Corinthians was written from *Philippi* by Stephanas, and Fortunatus, and Achaicus, and Timotheus." Now it is evident from an argument of Origen's in his treatise περὶ Εὐχῆς,[1] that no subscription of this kind was known to him; for he takes it for granted that St. Paul wrote this Epistle from *Ephesus* and not from Philippi. He is speaking of the congregation in which prayer is made; and is contending that besides the visible worshippers there are present also invisible angels, and the power of the Saviour, and the blessed spirits of the departed; and to prove the latter he adduces a text from the first Epistle to the Corinthians,[2] where "Paul says, 'when ye are gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus Christ;' as though the power of the Lord Jesus," proceeds Origen, "was connected not only with the Ephesians" (*i. e.* those amongst whom Paul was at the time) "but with the Corinthians" (*i. e.* those to whom he was writing). "Now, if Paul," he continues, "being yet enclosed in the body," and, as appears from the last paragraph, at Ephesus, "considered that he could help them with his spirit who were in Corinth, we must not deny that in like manner the blessed souls departed may come in the spirit to the Churches yet more readily than one who is in the body." Origen's date of the Epistle, it is true, is perfectly consistent with the internal evidence of the Epistle itself, as appears by comparing ch. xvi. 8 and 19; but it is entirely at variance with the subscription of the Epistle; and

[1] § 31, p. 269, Bened. Ed. [2] 1 Cor. v. 4.

confirms Paley's view of that subscription given in his "Horæ Paulinæ."[1]

I have hitherto been contemplating the case of whole passages of the text of the New Testament affected by the evidence of the Fathers; sustained, suspended, or proscribed by it. When we come to particular expressions and various readings, in proportion as they are vastly more numerous than the former, the value of that evidence becomes still more apparent.

Look at the well-known text, the 28th verse of the xxth chapter of the Acts. "Take heed therefore unto yourselves, and to all the flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood," *ποιμαίνειν τὴν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ ἣν περιεποιήσατο διὰ τοῦ ἰδίου αἵματος.* Here the evidence of the manuscripts is conflicting. Wetstein and Griesbach decide in favour of *τοῦ Κυρίου*, the latter particularly affirming that no MS. of very ancient date or high character presents the received reading *Θεοῦ*.[2] And yet the Vatican MS., perhaps that of the highest authority of all, was examined for the London edition of Griesbach's New Testament published in 1818, Dr. Burton tells us, and was found to contain this reading.[3] It has been observed by a very able writer in the "Monthly Censor," a shortlived periodical which appeared a few years ago, Number VIII., 1823, in a Review of Mr. Belsham's translation of St. Paul's Epistles, "We have been long aware that by those most hostile to the established faith, the labours of Griesbach have been looked upon with peculiar complacency."[4] But however that may

[1] c. xv. § 1.

[2] Griesbach, *in loc.*

[3] See Monitum ante Præf. p. ii.; Burton's Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 17.

[4] See *e. g.* Griesbach, 1 Tim. iii. 16, *ὃς ἐφανερώθη.* Yet see Porson's Letters to Travis, p. 143. "You will probably defend the latter reading (*i. e.* Θεὸς instead of ὃς), *nor shall I dispute it.*"

Rom. ix. 5. *Ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητός.* Griesbach, Θεός = Cypr. ed. Does this mean, Cyprian omits Θεός? = is the sign of omission; but what does ed. mean? Certainly the Benedictine Edition of Cyprian (Testim. Contra Judæos, II. c. vi.) has Deus. Bishop Middleton, after making some remarks on the Socinian conjecture on the text of this verse, viz. that we should read *ὢν ὁ*—a conjecture, says he, involving an argument which is improbable, and Greek which is impossible, adds, "Yet Griesbach has, in his new edition, honoured this conjecture with a place among his various readings."—On the Greek Article, *in loc.* In a paper in the Quarterly Review, No. 65, p. 80, on the controversy on 1 John v. 7 (written I conclude by Dr. Turton, now Bishop of Ely), is the following passage:—"It is the fashion to extol Griesbach's la-

be, the evidence of the Fathers certainly tends very much to turn the scale in favour of *Θεοῦ*, and the received text: and so far from being fairly represented by Griesbach, who says, "neque apud Patres certa lectionis istius vestigia deprehenduntur ante Epiphanium,"[1] the contrary is the truth. It is possible, nay probable, that Griesbach trusted to Wetstein's note upon this verse of the Acts, in which he professes to produce the authorities from the Fathers for and against the expression *αἷμα Θεοῦ*. But even then he could not have felt safe in making so unqualified an assertion. And besides, Wetstein's list itself is far from being either complete or accurate —not complete, for it omits several authorities in favour of the ordinary reading, as that of Clemens Alexandrinus; quotes partially that of Tertullian; omits several places in Origen which involve the term, whilst he extracts two which indirectly seem to resent it—not accurate, for he probably misquotes a passage from Athanasius contra Apollinarium, and by reading *καθ' ἡμᾶς* instead of *καθ' ὑμᾶς* reverses the meaning. "According to *you*," says Athanasius (not according to *us*), "the blood of God is not mentioned in Scripture, but this is the daring of the Arians."[2]

Let us turn then to the phraseology of the early Fathers in succession, and so judge for ourselves of the value of this assertion of Griesbach's "that no certain traces of the ordinary reading are to be found in them before Epiphanius."

In the Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians,[3] we have the following paragraph: "Being imitators of God; having animated yourselves by the blood of God, ye have performed perfectly the congenial work;" and if it be any satisfaction to any of my hearers to know it, the passage is found in the recently-discovered Syriac copy of this Epistle.

In the "Quis dives salvetur" of Clemens Alexandrinus occurs this sentence: "For they know not what a treasure we bear about us in our earthen vessels; a treasure protected

bours in that department. In matters of this moment it would be wrong to disguise our sentiments; and therefore, so far from expressing any admiration of his system, we avow our opinion that an edition of the Greek Testament which should adopt all his notions of the best readings, would vary much more from the original standard than the editions in common use."

[1] Griesbach, vol. ii. p. 115, 8vo.

[2] See the Review of Mr. Belsham's Translation of St. Paul's Epistles in the Monthly Censor, No. VIII., 1823. This Review is recommended strongly in a note to the above paper in the Quarterly Review.

[3] § 1.

by the power of God the Father, and the blood of God the Son, and by the dew of the Holy Ghost."[1]

In Tertullian, Ad Uxorem, II. c. iii., "I know we are not our own, but bought with a price; and what sort of price? *the blood of God.*" This passage Wetstein quotes, but there are several other passages in this author most concurrent in meaning with this, which he overlooks. Thus Tertullian speaks of "God being crucified"[2] over and over again. In his "De Carne Christi," he is bantering Marcion: "You talk of the folly of believing this and that.[3] . . . But God hath chosen the foolish things of the world to confound the wise . . . Foolish things are they which relate to the insults and *sufferings of God.* Or will they call it wisdom to say that *God was crucified?* You must get rid of this, Marcion; yes, in the very first place. For which is the most unworthy of God? which must we blush for most; that he should be born, or that he should die? that he should bear flesh, or bear the cross? that he should be circumcised or crucified? . . . Make answer to this, thou slayer of the truth! Was not God truly crucified? Having been truly crucified, did he not truly die? As he was truly dead, was he not truly raised to life? It was a fallacy, to be sure, of Paul's, when he determined to know nothing amongst us, save Jesus crucified: he falsely taught that he was buried; falsely inculcated that he was raised again. False, then, is our faith; and all that we hope from Christ is a vision! Most wicked of men to excuse the *murderers of God.*"[4] Whatever may be thought of the temerity of these words (a temerity characteristic of their author), we cannot deny that they lend the most unflinching support to the reading αἷμα Θεοῦ. Neither is it on one occasion only, or in a moment of peculiar heat, that this expression of Tertullian escapes him; he recurs to it elsewhere; and in his treatise against Marcion, uses the following language: "God acted with man that man might be enabled to act with God. God was made little, that man might be made great. If you despise such a God, I am at a loss to know whether you truly believe that God was crucified."[5] And once more in the same treatise:[6] "Well is it with Christians who believe that

[1] Clem. Alex. Quis dives salvetur, § xxxiv. p. 954.
[2] Tertullian, De Carne Christi, c. v.
[3] c. iv.
[4] c. v.
[5] Adv. Marcionem, II. c. xxvii.
[6] c. xvi.

God did die, and yet that he lives for ever." It is evident that, from whatever source derived, the mind of Tertullian is familiar with the idea of the αἷμα Θεοῦ. There is not one of these passages, except the first, of which Wetstein takes any notice.

On the other hand it is said, that Irenæus quotes the verse, and reads "ecclesiam Domini,"[1] as though Κυρίου were in his copy. But it must be borne in mind that we have not here the original text of Irenæus, but merely the language of his barbarous translator; which, though in general probably giving the substantial meaning of the author, cannot be depended upon as an authority for a various reading: moreover, that in several passages, where we happen to have the Greek as well as the translation, it appears that the translator was not nice in rendering either the term "God," or "Lord." Thus in Book V. c. iii. § 2, the Greek runs, τὰ δὲ τέχνης καὶ σοφίας μετέχοντα Θεοῦ, "things which partake of the art and wisdom of *God*;" but the translation has it, "quæ autem sapientiam participant *Domini*." So in Book V. c. ii. § 3, the Greek has it, "the body and blood of the *Lord* (τοῦ Κυρίου);" the Latin, "the body and blood of *Christ*." In the Preface to Book I. § 2, the Greek speaks of blasphemy against *Christ*, the Latin of blasphemy against *God*. So that it is clear in the case before us it cannot be concluded that Irenæus did not say ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, because the translator happens to say, "ecclesiam Domini." These instances of loose translation I have taken from Dr. Burton's "Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ;"[2] and I have little doubt many others might be added to them: indeed one I will name, in Book II. c. xxvi. § 1, where we have in the Greek, "blasphemers against their Lord or Master (δεσπότην);" but in the Latin, "blasphemers against their God."

Moreover, though it is true we do not find in Irenæus the exact phrase, "the blood of God," yet we do find in him language which approaches it very closely. Thus he says, This is the mystery which he" (Paul) "tells us was made known to him by revelation, that he who suffered under Pontius Pilate, the same is Lord of all, and King, and *God*."[3] And another expression which Irenæus uses may be con-

[1] Irenæus, III. c. xiv. § 2. [2] p. 19. [3] Irenæus, III. c. xii. § 9.

sidered as belonging to the same class, "that the Virgin Mary received the glad tidings by the word of the angel that she should conceive *God.*"[1] For it is probable that the same author who would speak of *conceiving* God, would find nothing objectionable in the phrase, *blood of God.*

But whatever may be the weight, be it more, or be it less, that we attach to the several passages from the Fathers which I have adduced on this subject, the purpose for which I have adduced them is answered; since none can deny, that, in determining the probable reading of Acts xx. 28, their testimony is of great importance; testimony which proves that the phrase *αἷμα Θεοῦ*, so far from being strange to the early Church, is thoroughly familiar to it, from whatever source derived.

I will take another example in illustration of the subject before us. In Rom. ix. 5, we have the text, according to our version, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever," *ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς εὐλογητὸς εἰς τοὺς αἰῶνας.* "Of whom, by natural descent, Christ came, God who is over all be blessed for ever," is the translation of the "Improved Version:" and there is added in a note, "The early Christian writers do not apply these words to Christ, but pronounce it to be rashness and impiety to say that Christ was God over all. The word God," it continues, "appears to have been wanting in Chrysostom's, and some other ancient copies; see Grotius, Erasmus, and Griesbach. It is a very plausible conjecture," it proceeds, "of Crellius, Schlichtingius, Whitby, and Taylor, that the original reading was *ὢν ὁ*, instead of *ὁ ὢν*. This would render the climax complete, *ὢν ἡ υἱοθεσία, ὢν οἱ πατέρες, ὢν ὁ Χριστὸς, ὢν ὁ Θεός*, 'of whom was the adoption, of whom were the Fathers, of whom was Christ, of whom was God, who is over all.' Nor is it likely, when the Apostle was professedly summing up the privileges of the Jews, that he should have overlooked the great privilege which was their chief boast, that God was in a peculiar sense their God." Such are the sentiments of the author of the "Improved Version," sentiments which one may remark, in passing, even the Greek subverts, requiring as it

[1] Irenæus, V. c. xix. § 1.

would a repetition of the article, ὢν ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων Θεὸς ὁ εὐλογητός, for which it makes no provision.

With respect to the omission of the word "God" in Chrysostom's, and other ancient copies, even Wetstein does not think it worth while to take any notice of it; and Griesbach, who does, and to whom the note in the "Improved Version" refers us, does so in a manner which only shows how frivolous is the argument drawn from that omission; for though Chrysostom, as Griesbach says, omits the clause, ὁ ὢν ἐπὶ πάντων Θεός, in his commentary on the passage; in the text, on which he is commenting, as given by him it stands; and so it does in other places in his works; the omission, which you see is not of Θεὸς merely, but of the whole paragraph, being here made by him no doubt for short, and to save writing. But no early Christian writers apply the words to Christ! What then says Irenæus? We have the passage only in the Latin translation it is true; but what is that translation? "Ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, *qui est Deus* super omnes benedictus in sæcula,"[1] "of whom as concerning the flesh is Christ, *who is God* over all blessed for ever;" the reading ὢν ὁ also disposed of by it as effectually as the assertion that the early Fathers do not apply the text to Christ. And Tertullian's authority is as clear upon the point as that of Irenæus; nay, even yet more satisfactory; not only because we have not to get at him through a translation, but because, though his rendering of the verse is not the same as that of Irenæus, it nevertheless points to the same Greek text of the verse; gives the same meaning to it; and what is more still, whilst it presents to us the verse twice, it is not in the two cases in exactly the same words or order of words, yet in both cases the signification is the same as before; the same as that of our own version; and in both cases there is still the same evidence as before that the Θεὸς was in his copy; and that his punctuation was the same as our own. "Ex quibus Christus, qui est Deus super omnia benedictus in ævum omne;"[2] and again, "quorum patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est super omnia Deus benedictus in ævum."[3] Testimony to the same effect is

[1] Irenæus, III. c. xvi. § 3.
[2] Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. xiii.
[3] c. xv.

afforded by Hippolytus;[1] by Origen,[2] though in this instance only in the Latin of Rufinus; by Cyprian[3]; and by others.[4]

I will just point to a few other examples of readings of Scripture, affected one way or other by the testimony of the Fathers, without entering on any comment. Thus in 1 Cor. x. 9. "Neither let us tempt Christ, as some of them also tempted," Κύριον is a reading recognised by Griesbach as bearing a comparison in authority with Χριστόν. However, "Nec tentemus *Christum*, quemadmodum quidam eorum tentaverunt," is the translation of Irenæus[5]; which, though not decisive of the question for reasons already assigned, must be taken into account in the discussion of it, valeat quantum valet.

In Rom. vii. 25, we have, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord:" εὐχαριστῶ τῷ Θεῷ is the received reading; χάρις τῷ Θεῷ a reading, according to Griesbach, not inferior to it; ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ a reading given by him in the notes as that of the Clermont, and St. Germain MSS. "Quis me liberabit de corpore mortis hujus?" is the way in which Irenæus renders the text; adding, "deinde infert liberatorem, gratia Jesu Christi Domini nostri:"[6] as though Irenæus understood it, "Who shall deliver me from the body of this death? The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ"; which, though not answering exactly to ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ, comes nearest to that reading.

In 1 John ii. 23, "Whosoever denieth the Son, the same hath not the Father:" this is the received text according to the Greek; there is added in our translation, "but he that acknowledgeth the Son hath the Father also": and Griesbach marks it as a probable addition to the received text, ὁ ὁμολογῶν τὸν υἱὸν καὶ τὸν πατέρα ἔχει. Cyprian supports this supplement, reading, "qui confitetur Filium, et Filium et Patrem habet."[7]

In Rev. xviii. 5, we have, according to the common reading, "For her sins have *reached* unto heaven" (ἠκολούθησαν),

[1] Hippolytus, Contra Noetum, c. ii.
[2] Origen, Comment. in Rom. lib. vii. § 13, vol. iv. p. 612.
[3] Cyprian, Testim. contra Judæos, II. c. vi.
[4] See Burton's Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 87, *et seq.*
[5] Irenæus, IV. c. xxvii. § 3.
[6] III. c. xx. § 3.
[7] Cyprian, Testim. adv. Judæos, II. c. xxvii.

"*cleaved* to the parties (ἐκολλήθησαν), even appearing against them in heaven," is the reading of the Alexandrine and Royal Paris MSS., and is adopted by Griesbach. Hippolytus in his treatise on Antichrist[1] confirms this latter reading.[2]

These examples, which might be multiplied to a very great extent, may suffice for the purpose of these Lectures.

I again entreat you to look at the great religious interests concerned in the question of patristical evidence—in the question of the use of the Fathers; and to observe how frequently the defence of the text of Scripture, where a various reading even may touch upon a serious heresy, devolves in a considerable degree upon them; and then to ask yourselves whether the study of them can be safely abandoned.

[1] Hippolytus, De Antichristo, § xl.

[2] I take it from Mill, who, in his Prolegomena to the New Testament, p. lxii., notices this and some other emendations of the ordinary text, which Hippolytus suggests. See Hippolytus, Ed. Fabricii, p. 33.

LECTURE X.

Use of the Fathers in unfolding the *meaning* of Scripture: I. Their testimony opposed to the Socinian scheme, 1°. In the *spirit* of their expositions, which is evangelical, not rationalistic. Extent to which the Old Testament is applied by them to Jesus Christ. Concurrence of our Church and of our standard divines in this principle of interpretation. The proof of it from the Fathers independent of the merit of their particular expositions. Actual uncertainty as to the extent of symbolical teaching in Scripture. 2°. On the doctrine of the Trinity. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. The Creed of the early Church shown to have been Trinitarian from the exposition of particular texts; from the opinions of early heretics; from primitive practices and formularies; and from the correspondence of the Athanasian Creed with the writers of the first three centuries. Unguarded language of these writers, especially of Origen, accounted for.

IN the last Lecture we discussed the question of the use of the Fathers in establishing the genuine *text* of Scripture. We will now consider the value they are of in helping us to unfold its *meaning*, remembering that they are in a very great degree the depositories of that traditional knowledge in the Church which, descending from the Apostles through a succession of ministers has served to maintain orthodoxy in the interpretation of Scripture on all the great fundamental articles of our faith.[1]

No doubt this subject was intimately involved in the last, the purport of Scripture being, of course, closely connected with the correctness of our own readings of the Scripture. Still there is a department of exposition, which the Fathers occupy, quite independent of disputed readings, supplying us, as they often do, with important information as to the *general* spirit which animated the early Church in handling Scripture, with keys to the interpretation of it found in the peculiar circumstances of the early Church, and certainly with many probable expositions of individual texts.

[1] See Origen, De Principiis, IV. § 9.

I.

§ 1. *On the spirit of Patristic Exposition.*

Thus it is a matter of the utmost consequence in the examination of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, and particularly of the prophetical parts of it, whether we take for our principle the Evangelical or the rationalistic scheme of interpretation. A tendency to the one or the other has been characteristic of certain theological schools from ancient times to our own. There may be a risk either way in extremes. The one may result in a low, barren, and unworthy view of a most mysterious book—the view, in short of a Socinian; the other in a wild, illogical, and imaginative theory of it, such as may seem to justify any excesses of the fanatic, and enable him to extract from Scripture conclusions of almost any form or fashion. But be the latter danger what it may, the principle of interpretation which the Fathers *encourage* is certainly the Evangelical principle, the principle of making Jesus Christ the focus, as it were, to which the rays of Scripture almost universally tend. "The Son of God is sown everywhere, all through the writings of Moses," is their dogma[1]; and again, "The Law as read by the Jews at this very time is but a fable; for they have not the key to the whole, which is the Advent of the Son of God to man; whereas, read by Christians, it is a treasure, hid indeed in the field, but revealed to them."[2]

Their position, it must be admitted, helped to foster in them this spirit. In contending with the Jews they could approach them by no other channel than the Old Testament: this was the only ground they and their antagonists could occupy in common, and accordingly they certainly do discover the Scriptures of the Old Testament to speak of Jesus Christ of Nazareth in season and out of season. For they hoped to arrive at the heart of the Israelite through the word that was

[1] Inseminatus est ubique in Scripturis ejus (sc. Moysi) Filius Dei.—Irenæus, IV. c. x. § 1. And again, shortly after, Et non est numerum dicere in quibus a Moyse ostenditur Filius Dei.

[2] Ὑπὸ Ἰουδαίων μὲν ἀναγινωσκόμενος ὁ νόμος ἐν τῷ νῦν καιρῷ, μύθῳ ἔοικεν· οὐ γὰρ ἔχουσι τὴν ἐξήγησιν τῶν πάντων, ἥτις ἐστὶν ἡ κατ' οὐρανὸν παρουσία τοῦ Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὑπὸ δὲ Χριστιανῶν ἀναγινωσκόμενος, θησαυρός ἐστι, κεκρυμμένος μὲν ἐν ἀγρῷ, αὐτοῖς δὲ ἀποκεκαλυμμένος.— Irenæus, IV. c. xxvi. § 1.

dear to him, and so to persuade him to listen to the Gospel which they had to disclose. Again, in contending with heretics, they had, to a very great extent, to disabuse them of a notion that the God of the Old Testament was not the God of the New; that the one was a God of justice, the other a God of mercy; and accordingly, in showing the harmony of the two Testaments, they certainly do push to the utmost the theory of their approximation. At the same time we probably owe it to the existence of this feeling, that lessons both from the Old and New Testament—the new and old things of the instructed scribe[1]—were appointed to be read in the same Services of the Church from the very first[2]; since a practical declaration was by this means made by the Church, that the Law was but the Gospel foreshowed—the Gospel but the Law fulfilled.[3]

Still, though the character of the sentiments of these several antagonists, with whom the early Fathers had to struggle, might tempt them sometimes to strain the principle of Evangelical interpretation beyond the bounds of discretion, the principle itself was most amply recognised by them, independently of all reference to heretic or Jew, and manifests itself in works of the Fathers which have no peculiar connection with either: the manner in which they used it for the refutation of the Jew and the heretic only falling in with their method of expounding Scripture at all times and under all circumstances. For, indeed, their impression was, that the Scriptures, being the work of the Holy Spirit, are not to be read as ordinary books; and that a mere literal interpretation of them would be derogatory to that Spirit.[4] "The Spirit of God," says Origen, when succinctly describing the subjects of prophecy, "the Spirit of God moved the prophets to foretell some things for their own times; others for future times; but above all (ἐξαιρετῶς) to speak of a certain Saviour of the human race, who was to come and dwell amongst men."[5] Accordingly (to name a few instances of a style characteristic

[1] Irenæus, IV. c. ix. § 1.

[2] Compare Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 67, with Tertullian, De Præscript. Hæret. c. xxxvi.

[3] Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthodoxos, ci. p. 182. Paris Ed. of Justin Martyr. See Hooker, Eccles. Pol. V. c. xx. § 6.

[4] Ad quam regulam etiam divinarum literarum intelligentia retinenda est, quo scilicet ea quæ dicuntur, non pro vilitate sermonis, sed pro divinitate sancti Spiritus qui eas conscribi inspiravit, censeantur.—Origen, De Principiis, IV. § 27.

[5] Contra Celsum, III. § 3.

of all the Fathers), so sober a writer as Clemens Romanus finds in the purple thread which Rahab was directed to hang out of her window, a sign, "That there will be redemption for all who believe and hope in God, through the blood of the Lord."[1] Justin Martyr explains the expression, "The government shall be upon *his shoulder*," to have relation to the Cross, against which the shoulder of the Saviour was fixed.[2] The spit on which the Paschal Lamb was roasted, and which he says was cruciform, he construes into the same emblem.[3] The staff by which Moses wrought his miracles, the tree planted by the water-side, the wood cast by Elisha into the Jordan, which raised up the head of the axe,[4] and many more incidents of the same kind, he still considers significant of the Cross. Theophilus discovers in the three days that elapsed before the creation of the heavenly bodies a type of the Trinity;[5] and in the blessing which God bestowed on the creatures which were made out of the water, whilst no blessing is recorded with respect to those made out of the earth, man excepted, he perceives a figure of Baptism and its benefits.[6] Irenæus, by no means a fanciful writer, and indeed chiefly engaged in the refutation of the fancies of others, still furnishes examples of the same method of interpreting Scripture. Jacob held fast by the heel, so Christ came forth conquering and to conquer. Jacob got the birthright; the Gentiles, the younger people, received Christ the first-born. Jacob gained the blessing; the Gentiles a greater blessing, which the Jews, the elder, despised. Twelve tribes were the foundations of the people of Israel; twelve Apostles pillars of the Gospel. Jacob had for his wages *spotted* sheep; Christ, a *variety* of people. Jacob married two sisters, that his offspring might be numerous; Christ begat a numerous race of the two laws. Jacob loved the younger sister best, so did Christ the younger Church. Such is the spirit of Irenæus: "Nihil enim vacuum," says he, "neque sine signo apud Deum."[7]

But the Psalms are the portion of Scripture in which the Fathers trace this secondary meaning in the most lively manner, and in the amplest detail. There they find all the par-

[1] Ad Corinthios, I. § xii.
[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 35.
[3] Dial. § 40.
[4] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 86.
[5] Theophilus, II. § 15. [6] II. § 16.
[7] Irenæus, IV. c. xxi. § 3.

ticulars of the Birth, Life, Passion, Resurrection, Ascension of Jesus, and his final triumph over the world. Did a Psalm say, "The dew of thy birth is of the womb of the morning," or as the Septuagint has it, ἐκ γαστρὸς πρὸ ἑωσφόρου ἐγέννησά σε, the early Fathers saw in it the miraculous Conception of Jesus.[1] Did another say, "The Lord is my light and my salvation; whom then shall I fear?" they saw in Jesus that light, lighting, as He did, every man that came into the world.[2] Did another say, "Thou wast my hope, when I hanged yet upon my mother's breasts;" they saw in it the Providence of God, which protected Jesus from Herod, whilst he was yet a babe at Bethlehem.[3] Did another say, "The kings of the earth stood up, and the rulers took counsel together against the Lord and against his anointed;" they saw in it the combination of Herod and the Jews, of Pilate and the soldiers against Jesus.[4] Did another say, "My heart also in the midst of my body is even as melting wax;" they saw in it the bloody sweat in which Jesus was dissolved the night before the Passion.[5] Did another say, "Hold not thy tongue, O God of my praise, for the mouth of the ungodly, yea the mouth of the deceitful is opened upon me;" they saw in it the complaint of Jesus touching the treachery of Judas.[6] Did another say, "Thou hast heard me also from among the horns of the unicorns;" they saw in the horns of the unicorns the arms of the Cross of Jesus.[7] Did another say, "I laid me down and slept, and rose up again, for the Lord sustained me;" they saw in it the Death, Burial, and Resurrection of Jesus.[8] Did another say, "Lift up your heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of glory shall come in;" they saw in it the Ascension of Jesus, and his entrance once more into heaven.[9] Did another say, "He rejoiceth as a giant to run his course;" they saw in it the glorious race of Jesus and his Gospel over all the world.[10] Did

[1] Psalm cx. 3; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 63, *et alibi*.

[2] Psalm xxvii. 1; Origen, Contra Celsum, VI. § 5.

[3] Psalm xxii. 9; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 102.

[4] Psalm ii. 2; Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 40.

[5] Psalm xxii. 14; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 103.

[6] Psalm cix. 1; Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 11.

[7] Psalm xxii. 21; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 105.

[8] Psalm iii. 5; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 97.

[9] Psalm xxiv. 7; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 85.

[10] Psalm xix. 5; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 69.

another say, "My tongue is the pen of a ready writer;" they saw in it the rapid dispersion of the Gospel effected by the short ministry of Jesus.[1] Did another say, "He sent his Word and healed them, and they were saved from their destruction;" they saw in it the mission of Jesus, and the blessed ends it effected.[2] This is the manner in which the Fathers understood the Psalms, herein not exhibiting their own sentiments merely, but certainly reflecting those of the Primitive Church itself, which caused the book of Psalms, on account of this its Evangelical character, to be read constantly in the congregation. For that it did so seems certain, both from the accuracy with which Justin Martyr quotes the Psalms, as compared with his mode of citing any other book of Scripture, an accuracy apparently derived from constant use[3]; from the incidental way in which he sometimes touches on a Psalm, as though he presumed that this portion of Scripture was familiar to every Christian worshipper, and only needed to be named in order to be remembered[4]; and from what would seem to be the express testimony of Tertullian[5]—a testimony which, perhaps, we may consider to be confirmed by Pliny, who, when describing to Trajan the principal feature of the devotions of the Christians, tells him that "they sung, or said *hymns* to *Christ as God*, repeating them by turns."[6] There were those at that time who would have preferred a more trivial mode of interpretation—who would rather have construed one of the Psalms, for instance, of Hezekiah, or another of Solomon, than either of them of Jesus.[7] But the early Fathers, and the Church of which they were in this the exponents, had no sympathy with such commentators; neither has our own Church, as we may conclude from her application of particular Psalms to the services on her great Fasts and Festivals; the day itself a sufficient argument of the sense in which she understands them,

[1] Psalm xlv. 2; Origen, De Principiis, IV. § 5.

[2] Psalm cvii. 20; Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 31.

[3] See Justin Martyr, Dial. § 22. Otto, n. 7; and Thirlby, *in loc.*

[4] See Justin Martyr, Dial. § 30.

[5] Quantam autem castigationem merebuntur etiam illæ, quæ *inter Psalmos*, vel in quâcunque Dei mentione retecta perseverant!—De Virginibus Velandis, c. xvii. Jam vero, prout Scripturæ leguntur, aut *Psalmi canuntur*, aut adlocutiones proferuntur, aut petitiones delegantur, &c.—De Animâ, c. ix.

[6] Carmenque Christo, quasi Deo, dicere secum invicem.—Plinii Epistolar. lib. X. ep. xcvii.

[7] Psalm cx.; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 33. Psalm lxxii.; Justin Martyr, Dial. § 34.

as it also is of her interpretation of the Lessons which she selects on such occasions from the Old Testament, and which must have an Evangelical meaning in order to be appropriate.

Nor have the greatest or even the most sober of our standard divines failed to show their respect for the same principle—those divines who flourished at a period so different from our own, when the writings of the Fathers formed a staple in the study of theology, and imparted to it something of the spirit which breathed forth from themselves. No man, I presume, will class Dr. South with fanatics, or feel that he was a person to be run away with by any vain and visionary system of Scripture interpretation. Indeed, we shall find, perhaps, no one of our Church more sound upon all the great points of theology, as we shall find none bringing to the examination of them more masculine powers of mind, or a more thorough contempt for nonsense of any kind. Look, then, at the view he takes of the principle of Scriptural exposition which I have been setting forth, as recommended by the authority and practice of the Fathers, in his sermon on the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah.[1] After exposing in some detail the absurdity of one Rabbi Saadias, in supposing this famous chapter to be spoken of Jeremiah, he proceeds to deal out some heavy blows against a more illustrious name for adopting the same exposition of this particular text, and in general for the tone of his annotations on Scripture, Grotius. "So, then, we have here an interpretation," says he, "but as for the sense of it, that, for aught I see, must shift for itself. But whether thus to drag and hale words both from sense and context, and then to squeeze whatsoever meaning we please out of them, be not (as I may speak with some change of the prophet's phrase) to draw lies with cords of blasphemy, and nonsense as it were with a cart rope, let any sober and impartial hearer or reader be judge. For whatsoever titles the itch of novelty and Socinianism has thought fit to dignify such immortal, incomparable, incomprehensible interpreters with, yet if these interpretations ought to take place, the said prophecies (which all before Grotius and the aforesaid Rabbi Saadias unanimously fixed—in the first sense of them—upon the sole person of the Messiah) might have been actually

[1] Vol. ii. p. 472, Oxf. Ed.

fulfilled, and consequently the veracity of God in the said prophecies strictly accounted for, though Jesus of Nazareth had never been born. Which being so, would any one have thought that the author of the book 'De Veritate Religionis Christianæ et de Satisfactione Christi' could be also the author of such interpretations as these? No age certainly ever produced a mightier man in all sorts of learning than Grotius, nor more happily furnished with all sorts of arms, both offensive and defensive, for the vindication of the Christian faith, had he not in his Annotations too frequently turned the edge of them the wrong way."[1]

Now I confess it seems to me a matter of great importance to establish the fact that the early Fathers, in their method of interpreting Scripture, did, as a general rule, embrace this Evangelical principle: that they are thoroughly Anti-Socinian; that the sense in which Scripture was understood by the best-informed Christians, who lived in the times immediately after those of the Apostles themselves, was an Anti-Socinian sense. I am not prepared to defend their interpretations in every case. I will not even deny that a collection of instances of exposition of Scripture might be made from them, where this principle is pushed to a point which might expose them to profane ridicule; but I do say it is a great support to the orthodox faith that a fundamental feature of the primitive exegetical theology is found to be, the persevering manner in which it ceases not to teach and preach Jesus Christ; and this fact we ascertain through the primitive Fathers. Doubtless it may be a question whether the *scarlet* thread which Rahab hung out at the window was a type of the saving nature of the Blood of the Atonement, as the Fathers represent it; yet the Epistle to the Hebrews appears to contemplate a significancy of this sort in the scarlet wool of the Law, for "when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people according to the Law, he took the blood of calves and of goats, with water,

[1] Dr. South then adds in a note, "The truth is the matter lay deeper than so, for there was a party of men whom Grotius had unhappily engaged himself with, who were extremely disgusted at the book De Satisfactione Christi, written by him against Socinus, and therefore he was to pacify (or rather satisfy) these men, by turning his pen another way in his Annotations, which also was the true reason that he never answered Crellius; a shrewd argument, no doubt, to such as shall well consider these matters, that those in the Low Countries, who at that time went by the name of Remonstrants and Arminians, were indeed a great deal more."

and *scarlet wool*, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people, saying, This is the blood of the Testament which God hath enjoined unto you."[1] Or it may be still more a question whether the number ten, that of the Commandments, being expressed by the letter ι, indicated Jesus[2]; yet there is a mystery in the number of the beast. Or it may be disputed whether the breaking of the first set of Tables, and the renewal of the same, intimated that the Law was to be superseded by the Gospel[3]; yet the veil on Moses' face indicated the eclipse of the Gospel under the Law.[4] Moreover, it would certainly have been made a subject of debate, too, had not St. Paul himself resolved the doubt, whether, when in the Levitical Law, God commanded that the ox should not be muzzled which trod out the corn, he was contemplating in that injunction any sanction to a provision for a Christian Priesthood; yet we know he was.[5] The truth may seem to be, that we are not to *assert* that ritual or historical facts in the Old Testament are symbols of such or such Christian duties or ordinances, except where they are expressly declared to be such by competent authorities in the New Testament; but we may be allowed to *suspect* that God intended us to draw inferences of a similar kind to those he has himself thought fit to put on record, from similar passages for ourselves, as a wholesome exercise of our minds, and an exercise calculated to strengthen our faith in the leading doctrines of Christianity—and this appears from a passage already referred to, to have been the distinction of Origen himself[6]—that it may be a part of God's scheme of

[1] Heb. ix. 19.

[2] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xii. p. 305; and compare II. c. iv. p. 194.

[3] Stromat. VI. § xvi. pp. 807–8.

[4] 2 Cor. iii. 13, 16. [5] 1 Tim. v. 18.

[6] De Principiis, IV. § 9. Καὶ ὅτι μὲν οἰκονομίαι εἰσί τινες μυστικαὶ δηλούμεναι διὰ τῶν θείων γραφῶν, πάντες καὶ οἱ ἀκεραιότατοι τῶν τῷ λόγῳ προσιόντων πεπιστεύκασι· τίνες δὲ αὗται, οἱ εὐγνώμονες καὶ ἄτυφοι ὁμολογοῦσι μὴ εἰδέναι . . . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐπὰν ἡ κατασκευὴ τῆς σκηνῆς ἀναγινώσκηται, πειθόμενοι τύπους εἶναι τὰ γεγραμμένα, ζητοῦσιν ἃ δυνήσονται ἐφαρμόσαι ἑκάστῳ τῶν κατὰ τὴν σκηνὴν λεγομένων· ὅσον μὲν ἐπὶ τῷ πείθεσθαι ὅτι τύπος τινός ἐστιν ἡ σκηνὴ, οὐ διαμαρτάνοντες· ὅσον δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ τῷδέ τινι ἀξίως τῆς γραφῆς ἐφαρμόζειν τὸν λόγον οὗ ἐστι τύπος ἡ σκηνὴ, ἔσθ' ὅτε ἀποπίπτοντες. "That there are certain mystical dispensations indicated by the Divine Scriptures, every Christian, however simple, believes; but what they may be, sensible and modest men confess that they know not. . . . But when the structure of the Tabernacle is read of, those who are persuaded that the description is typical try to find out what they can adapt to several things said of the Tabernacle. Now, so far as they are persuaded that the Tabernacle is a type of something, they

revelation to leave us in some uncertainty with respect to the *extent* of his teaching by types, in order to test the spirit we are of, by the application we are disposed to make of what may, or may not be, hints from him, and thus to elicit tokens of our indifference or our zeal. Our blessed Lord himself seems to point to some such dispensation on several occasions: "Ye do err, not knowing the Scriptures," said he to the Sadducees, and yet the proof of their ignorance consisted in their not having perceived the resurrection of the dead to be taught in the words, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob:" and again, when the disciples were desponding, as they walked to Emmaus, he charged them with foolishness, because they had not detected all the incidents of the closing scene of his earthly life in Moses and the prophets.

§ 2.

On the Doctrine of the Trinity.

I THINK what has already been said may suffice to prove that the *general complexion* of the theology of the early Fathers is Anti-Socinian. But the question being so vital a one, I will not leave it here, but will pursue the inquiry somewhat further, and show that the primitive Fathers are in spirit thoroughly opposed to the *several leading doctrines* of the Socinians—I say in spirit, because writing as they do before the subtleties of captious religionists had taught the defenders of the faith once committed to the saints, terms of precision in their arguments, it frequently happens that expressions escape them, of which advantage may be taken by those who seek occasion for it, and who are not at the pains, or perhaps have not the necessary reading, to balance those expressions by others less equivocal in the same Father, and by the stream of testimony his works supply, to correct any occasional and incidental obliquity.

The doctrine of the Godhead, as laid down in the Racovian

cannot mistake; but so far as they apply the word of Scripture rightly to this particular or that, they certainly may get into error."

Catechism is this, that "in the essence of God there is but one Person;" and that "inasmuch as the essence of God is but one in number, there cannot be so many Persons therein, since a Person is nothing but an individual intelligent essence."[1]

Now, in spite of many unguarded phrases which from time to time fall from the Fathers—unguarded, I say, because entirely at variance with their ordinary teaching—it is not to be denied that the faith of the Sub-Apostolic Church was Trinitarian.

Thus the *casual* language of the very earliest Fathers we have is Trinitarian; even where there is no direct intention of insisting on the doctrine. I allude to such passages as the following: in Hermas,[2] "The farm is the world: the Son of the owner is the Holy Spirit: the servant is the Son of God." —In Clemens Romanus,[3] "Our Lord Jesus Christ, the sceptre of the Majesty of God, did not come in the pomp of splendour and pride, although having this within his reach, but in humbleness of mind, as the Holy Spirit speaks concerning him." And here I may observe that the Holy Spirit, when thus introduced, is certainly understood as a Person; for in the Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians,[4] when a similar use of the name occurs, τὸ Πνεῦμα is coupled with a masculine particle, τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ἐκήρυσσεν λέγων, as is the case in the Gospel of St. John,[5] and in St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians[6]; a similar construction is found in Justin Martyr,[7] and in Clemens Alexandrinus.[8] And it may be further remarked, in support of this inference, that "verbum," as used in the early translation of Irenæus, is frequently joined to a masculine adjective, where "verbum" stands for the second Person of the Trinity.[9] But to return—In Ignatius,[10] "Our God, Jesus Christ, was conceived by Mary according to the

[1] Racovian Catechism, Of the Knowledge of God, c. i. The Racovian Catechism was drawn up by Socinus, and is accounted the common creed of the whole sect, to which he gives a name.—Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. Cent. XVI. Sec. III. Pt. II. c. vii. § 12.

[2] Lib. III. Similitud. V. § 5.

[3] Ad Corinth. I. § xvi.

[4] Ad Philadelph. § vii.

[5] Ὅταν δὲ ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς ἀληθείας.—John xvi. 13.

[6] Ἐσφραγίσθητε τῷ Πνεύματι τῆς ἐπαγγελίας τῷ ἁγίῳ ὅς ἐστιν ἀρραβὼν τῆς κληρονομίας ἡμῶν.—Ephes. i. 13, 14.

[7] Dial. § 25.

[8] Pædag. II. c. iv. p. 193; Stromat. II. § xx. p. 495.

[9] Idoneus est et sufficiens ad formationem omnium proprium ejus Verbum. —Irenæus, II. c. ii. § 5. Si autem Verbum Patris, qui descendit, ipse est et qui ascendit.—I. c. ix. § 3.

[10] Ignatius, Ad Ephes. § xviii.

dispensation of God (*i. e.* the Father) of the seed of David, and of the Holy Ghost;" and again,[1] "Give all diligence, therefore, to confirm yourselves in the doctrine of the Lord and of the Apostles, that in whatever ye do ye may prosper both in body and soul, by faith and love, in the Son, and the Father, and the Spirit;" and once more,[2] "Be obedient to the Bishop and to one another, even as Jesus Christ in the flesh was obedient to the Father, and the Apostles to Christ, and the Father, and the Spirit." The martyrdom of Polycarp furnishes evidence of the same unobtrusive but most satisfactory character for the Trinitarian creed of the early Church. We cannot, I think, read that authentic and most interesting document without feeling that such form of faith transpires through it, as in undisputed possession of the Church in Polycarp's time. This is some of the language of the martyr's prayer. "O Lord God Almighty, Father of thy blessed and beloved Son Jesus Christ. . . . . I bless thee for that thou hast counted me worthy of this day and of this hour, that I should have part in the number of thy martyrs, in the cup of thy Christ, unto the resurrection of life everlasting, of soul and body, in the incorruption of the Holy Ghost. . . . . For this, and for all things else, I praise thee, I bless thee, I glorify thee together with Jesus Christ, the Eternal, the Celestial, thy beloved Son; with whom be glory to thee and the Holy Ghost now and ever."[3] The Liturgical fragment of the Ter-Sanctus, here, no doubt, quoted by the martyr, itself running in a triplet, is still a subordinate ingredient in the proof.

Then the manner in which the early Fathers interpret certain texts as appertaining to the Trinity, even where it may be matter of question whether those texts strictly bear such meaning, is very satisfactory, though still oblique, testimony to the doctrine being settled and dominant in their minds. Such is the exposition Irenæus gives of Ephes. iv. 6. "One Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all." "The Father is above all, and he is the head of Christ; the Word is through all, and he is the head of the Church; the Spirit is in us all, and he is the living water which the Lord vouchsafes to all who rightly believe in him

[1] Ad Magnes. § xiii.
[2] Ibid.
[3] Martyrium Polycarpi, § xiv.; Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. iv. § 15.

and love him."[1] And Hippolytus understands the text in the same way.[2] Who but a member of a Trinitarian Church would have ventured to propound this comment, without the slightest misgiving or apology? Of a similar character is the comment of Theophilus on an incident in the Mosaic history of the creation.[3] "The three days," says he, "which elapsed before the lights in the firmament were made, are types of the Trinity, of God, of his Son, and of his Wisdom." It is incredible that a casual remark of such a nature as this should have been dropped, except the doctrine of the Trinity had been generally known and acknowledged. And the same conclusion would seem to follow from the adoption of the term "holy trinity," as a metaphor, which we find as early as Clemens Alexandrinus, who applies ἡ ἁγία τριὰς to the three virtues, faith, hope, and charity.[4]

Again, the heresy of Simon Magus supplies us with another argument to the same effect, quite independent of these last, but of the like incidental kind; the more valuable, too, as being the unintentional witness of an enemy. Simon Magus is always represented as the first of the heretics, being, indeed, the contemporary of the Apostles themselves. Whatever light, therefore, his proceedings may serve to cast upon the orthodox faith, is from a quarter entitled to the utmost attention; the date of the testimony considered. Now Simon Magus gave himself out as the most High, who appeared amongst the Jews as the Son; in Samaria as the Father; and amongst the Gentiles as the Holy Ghost.[5] But it is scarcely possible to suppose that he would have made this representation of himself, unless the orthodox doctrine of the Church (of which that of the heretics was in general a caricature) had furnished him with some pretence for it; and unless the Godhead of the Son, of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, and their Unity, in some shape had been an article of belief familiar to men's minds. So great is the force which Mr. Wilson ascribes to the argument, that "from this historical fact," says he, "without any reference to the New Testament, had the Gospels even never been written, we might conclude, with some probability, that Christ himself had claimed Divinity,

[1] Irenæus, V. c. xviii. § 2.
[2] Hippolytus, Contra Noetum, § xiv.
[3] Theophilus, Ad Autolycum, II. § 15.
[4] Stromat. IV. § vii. p. 588.
[5] Irenæus, I. c. xxiii. § 1.

and taught the doctrine of the Trinity in Unity in some sense or other."[1]

The truth, no doubt, was, that the perpetual recurrence of formularies that embodied this doctrine kept it constantly before the eyes of Christians. Baptism, for instance, was notoriously administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, from the first—even trine immersion is a practice attending it so early, as to be lost in antiquity—and a public confession of faith was made at it, expressive, as we know, of the three Persons of the Godhead; a confession directly affirmed to have commenced with the very Gospel itself[2]—nec meus hic sermo—Basil, a Father of the fourth century, expressly asserts, when writing on the subject of the Holy Spirit, that such was the *force of custom*, such the *strength of tradition* on this question, that the speculations of private individuals were controlled by it, and that they would not venture to set up their own opinions against an authority, which bore them down.[3]

So many elements, then, of evidence for a Trinitarian creed —(I have only given examples of whole classes)—are afloat in patristic theology from the most primitive times; and these, again, insensibly as it were, give place to distinct and technical expressions of such a creed, as heresies spring up, and controversies with them, calculated to call forth such manifestoes, and to bring ideas previously existing to a point—and all this, before the more formal symbols of faith which we now possess, agreed upon in Councils, had made their appearance, as far as we know—though these latter, again, are still to be regarded simply as exponents of the truth as it was held from the beginning, and not as any new discoveries of it, and are probably very much more ancient in substance than the dates formally assigned to them. It will be convenient, then, to show the further development of the question by taking the more prominent clauses of the Athana-

[1] Illustration of the method of explaining the New Testament by the early opinions of Jews and Christians concerning Christ, p. 230. Cambridge, 1838.

[2] Hanc regulam ab initio evangelii decucurrisse. Tertullian, Adversus Praxeam, c. ii.

[3] Πλὴν ἀλλὰ πολλαχοῦ καὶ αὐτὸς τῆς συνηθείας τὸ ἰσχυρὸν δυσωποῦμενος, εὐσεβεῖς φωνὰς ἀφῆκε περὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος . . . . οὕτως, οἶμαι, τὸ τῆς παραδόσεως ἰσχυρὸν ἐνῆγε πολλάκις τοὺς ἄνδρας καὶ τοῖς οἰκείοις ἑαυτῶν δόγμασιν ἀντιλέγειν.—Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, c. xxix.

sian Creed, those, I mean, which relate more particularly to the metaphysical qualities of the Deity, and demonstrate that the raw material of them is discoverable in the writings of the first three centuries; thus antedating Dr. Waterland's valuable illustrations of the same document, who draws his vouchers almost altogether from Augustine, a Father whose phraseology, no doubt, being more dressed by theological rule, comes closer to that of the Creed.[1]

Irenæus, IV. c. xxxiii. § 7.—"Moreover he" (*i. e.* the true believer, § 1) "will *condemn* all those who are without the truth; that is, without the Church: but he will be himself condemned of none. For with him all things will be consistent. And he has perfect faith in *one God Almighty*, of whom are all things; and in the *Son of God*, Christ Jesus our Lord, by whom are all things; and his persuasion is firm touching his Incarnation, whereby the Son of God became man: and in the *Spirit of God*, who supplies a knowledge of the truth, and expounds the dispensations of the Father and the Son throughout all generations of men, according to the pleasure of the Father."[2]

Whosoever will be saved: before all things it is necessary that he hold the Catholic Faith.

Which Faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled: without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

And the Catholic Faith is this: that we worship one God in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity;

Cyprian, Ep. lxxiii.—"How then can some who are without the Church, nay against the Church, maintain, that provided a Gentile be baptized in the name of Jesus Christ in any way whatever, he will obtain remission of sins? whereas

[1] I have contented myself with quoting a limited number of authorities under each clause. It would have been easy to have accumulated them to almost any extent, as may be seen by turning to Mr. Bailey's Rituale Anglo-Catholicum, which by no means exhausts them—a most useful work to all who study the elements of our Prayer Book—from which indeed, and from Dr. Burton's Ante-Nicene Testimonies to the doctrine of the Trinity, I have occasionally borrowed a reference, where one happened to present itself, more apposite, as I thought, than any which my own notes supplied.

[2] Iudicabit autem et omnes eos qui sunt extra veritatem, id est qui sunt extra ecclesiam; ipse autem a nemine judicabitur. Omnia enim ei constant: *εἰς ἕνα Θεὸν παντοκράτορα, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα, πίστις ὁλόκληρος· καὶ εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ Ιησοῦν Χριστόν, τὸν Κύριον ἡμῶν, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα, καὶ τὰς οἰκονομίας αὐτοῦ, δι' ὧν ἄνθρωπος ἐγένετο ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, πεισμονὴ βεβαία· καὶ εἰς τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Θεοῦ,* qui præstat agnitionem veritatis. *τὸ τὰς οἰκονομίας Πατρός τε καὶ Υἱοῦ σκηνοβατοῦν καθ' ἑκάστην γενεὰν ἐν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις, καθὼς βούλεται ὁ Πατήρ.*

Christ himself commands the nations to be baptized in the name of the *full and united Trinity.*"[1]

Neither confounding the Persons: nor dividing the Substance.

Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. iii.—"Why then should God seem to suffer *division* and *dispersion* in the Son and the Holy Ghost, who have the second and third places allotted them, *consubstantial* as they are with the Father; when He suffered no such thing in the angels who are many in number and are not of the same substance as himself?"[2]

Justin Martyr, Dial. § 128.—"And that that Power which the prophetic word calls also God, as hath been in like manner shown at large, and Angel, is not nominally different only, as the light is nominally different from the sun" (in allusion to a previous illustration), "but is *numerically different*, I have briefly shown already, when I said that this Power is begotten of the Father, by his power and will, *not however by division, as though the substance of the Father was separated*, even as all other things when separated and divided are not the same as they were before such division. And I took as an example this fact, that from one fire we see other fires lighted; the fire, from which many may be lighted, suffering no diminution, but still continuing the same."[3]

Origen in Joannem, tom. ii. § 6, vol. iv. p. 62. (When commenting on the text, "All things were made by him,"[4] Origen volunteers to discuss whether the Holy Ghost is in-

[1] Quomodo ergo quidam dicunt foris extra Ecclesiam immo et contra Ecclesiam, modo in nomine Jesu Christi, ubicumque et quomodocumque gentilem baptizatum remissionem peccatorum consequi posse, quando ipse Christus gentes baptizari jubeat in plenâ et adunatâ Trinitate.

[2] Quale est ut Deus divisionem et dispersionem pati videatur in Filio et in Spiritu Sancto, secundum et tertium sortitis locum, tam consortibus substantiæ Patris, quas non patitur in tot angelorum numero, et quidem tam a substantiâ alienis.

[3] Καὶ ὅτι δύναμις αὕτη, ἣν καὶ Θεὸν καλεῖ ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, ὡς διὰ πολλῶν ὡσαύτως ἀποδέδεικται, καὶ ἄγγελον, οὐχ ὡς τὸ τοῦ ἡλίου φῶς ὀνόματι μόνον ἀριθμεῖται, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀριθμῷ ἕτερόν τι ἐστί, καὶ ἐν τοῖς προειρημένοις διὰ βραχέων τὸν λόγον ἐξήτασα, εἰπὼν τὴν δύναμιν ταύτην γεγεννῆσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς δυνάμει καὶ βουλῇ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλ' οὐ κατὰ ἀποτομήν, ὡς ἀπομεριζομένης τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς οὐσίας, ὁποῖα τὰ ἄλλα πάντα μεριζόμενα καὶ τεμνόμενα οὐ τὰ αὐτά ἐστιν ἃ καὶ πρὶν τμηθῆναι· καὶ παραδείγματος χαριν παρειλήφειν τὰ ὡς ἀπὸ πυρὸς ἀναπτόμενα πυρὰ ἕτερα ὁρῶμεν, οὐδὲν ἐλαττουμένου ἐκείνου, ἐξ οὗ ἀναφθῆναι πολλὰ δύνανται, ἀλλὰ ταὐτοῦ μένοντος.

[4] John i. 3.

cluded, and proceeds), "There will still, however, be a third opinion besides the two which maintain, one of them that the Holy Ghost was made by the Word, the other that it was uncreated; and this third opinion is, that the Holy Ghost is not by itself a Person, distinct from the Father and the Son . . . . We, however, are persuaded that there are *three Persons*, the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, and believing that there is nothing unproduced, besides the Father, we accept it as the more pious notion and as the true one, that whereas all things were made by the Word, the Holy Ghost is of more honour than them all, and in rank higher than all things that were made by the Father through Christ. And this, perhaps, is the reason why he is not called the very Son of God; the Only Begotten alone being by nature the Son from the beginning; of whom the Holy Ghost seems to have stood in need, as having ministered to his Hypostasis (or Personality), not merely as to his existing, but as to his being wise, and rational, and just, and all that one ought to think Him to be, as the sharer of those qualities which we have already described to belong to Christ."[1]

For there is one Person of the Father, another of the Son: and another of the Holy Ghost.

Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. xi.—"Thus briefly, but evidently is the distinction of the Trinity set forth. For it is the Spirit himself, who speaks; the Father, to whom he speaks; the Son, of whom he speaks. In like manner, other things which are spoken, sometimes to the Father of the Son, or to the Son; some-

[1] Ἔσται δέ τις καὶ τρίτος παρὰ τοὺς δύο, τόν τε διὰ τοῦ Λόγου παραδεχόμενον τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον γεγονέναι, καὶ τὸν ἀγέννητον αὐτὸν εἶναι ὑπολαμβάνοντα, δογματίζων μηδὲ οὐσίαν τινα ἰδίαν ὑφεστάναι τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος ἑτέραν παρὰ τὸν Πατέρα καὶ τὸν Υἱόν . . . . ἡμεῖς μέντοιγε τρεῖς ὑποστάσεις πειθόμενοι τυγχάνειν, τὸν Πατέρα, καὶ τὸν Υἱόν. καὶ τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, καὶ ἀγέννητον μηδὲν ἕτερον τοῦ Πατρὸς εἶναι πιστεύοντες, ὡς εὐσεβέστερον καὶ ἀληθὲς προσιέμεθα τὸ, πάντων διὰ τοῦ Λόγου γενομένων, τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα πάντων εἶναι τιμιώτερον, καὶ τάξει πάντων τῶν ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ Χριστοῦ γεγενημένων. Καὶ τάχα αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ αἰτία τοῦ μὴ καὶ αὐτὸ υἱὸν χρηματίζειν τοῦ Θεοῦ, μόνου τοῦ Μονογενοῦς φύσει Υἱοῦ ἀρχῆθεν τυγχάνοντος, οὗ χρήζειν ἔοικε τὸ ἅγιον Πνεῦμα, διακονοῦντος αὐτοῦ τῇ ὑποστάσει, οὐ μόνον εἰς τὸ εἶναι, ἀλλὰ καὶ σοφὸν εἶναι καὶ λογικὸν καὶ δίκαιον, καὶ πᾶν ὁτιποτοῦν χρὴ αὐτὸ νοεῖν τυγχάνειν. κατὰ μετοχὴν τῶν προειρημένων ἡμῖν Χριστοῦ ἐπινοιῶν.

In which passage it must be borne in mind that οὐσίαν means Person; the parties Origen had in his eye being the disciples of Noetus, the precursors of the Sabellians; and that ὑποστάσεις has the same signification; the argument continuing to glance at the same heresy which confounded the Persons. See Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. sec. 2, c. ix. § 11, p. 117, fol.

times to the Son of the Father, or to the Father; sometimes to the Spirit; *establish each Person in his own proper self.*"

c. xii.—"But if the number of the Trinity stagger thee, as if the Trinity were not, therefore, knit together in *simple Unity*, I ask, how does the one single Being speak in the plural, where he says, Let us make man after our image and likeness; instead of saying, I will make man after my image and likeness, as being himself one and singular?"[1]

The Father uncreate, the Son uncreate: and the Holy Ghost uncreate.

Irenæus, IV. c. xx. § 1.—"For there is ever present with him" (the Father), "the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom he made all things freely and of his own accord; and to whom he speaks when he says, Let us make man after our image and likeness."[2]

III. c. viii. § 3.—"But that he made all things freely and as he pleased, David again asserts, 'Our God is in heaven above, and in earth he doeth all things according to his pleasure.'[3] Now the things constituted differ from him who constitutes them, and the things made from him who made them. For he is himself *not made*, and is without beginning and without end, and has need of nothing, himself sufficing for himself, and for all other things, imparting to them, indeed, the very privilege of existing. But the things which have been made by him had a beginning; and the things which had a beginning may have an end, and are in subjection, and have need of him who made them: it is altogether necessary, therefore, that they should be distinguished by a different term, by all who have any moderate sense of discrimination; so that he, who made all things, together with his Word should be justly called God and Lord

[1] His itaque paucis tamen manifeste distinctio Trinitatis exponitur. Est enim ipse qui pronuntiat Spiritus, et Pater ad quem pronuntiat, et Filius de quo pronuntiat. Sic et cætera quæ nunc ad Patrem de Filio, vel ad Filium, nunc ad Filium de Patre, vel ad Patrem, nunc ad Spiritum pronuntiantur; unamquamque personam in suâ proprietate constituunt.

Si te adhuc numerus scandalizat Trinitatis, quasi non connexæ in unitate simplici, interrogo quomodo unicus et singularis pluraliter loquitur: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram; cum debuerit dixisse, Faciam hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem meam, utpote unicus et singularis?

[2] Adest enim ei semper Verbum et Sapientia, Filius et Spiritus, per quos et in quibus omnia libere et sponte fecit, ad quos et loquitur, dicens: Faciamus hominem ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.

[3] Psalm cxv. 3.

alone: but that *the things which are made* should not be expressed by the same term, nor have a word applied to them which belongs to the Creator." [1]

The Father incomprehensible, the Son incomprehensible: and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible.

Clemens Alexandrinus, Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 123.—"O mysterious wonder! The Father of the universe is one; and the Word of the universe is one; and the Holy Ghost is one and the *same everywhere*." [2]

Irenæus, IV. c. iv. § 2.—"And well he spake who said, that the measureless Father is measured in the Son, for the Son is the measure of the Father, since he contains him." [3]

The Father eternal, the Son eternal: and the Holy Ghost eternal.

c. xx. § 3.—"That the Word, that is the Son, *was ever* with the Father, we have demonstrated at length: and that Wisdom, which is the Spirit, was with him *before all worlds*, it saith by Solomon." [4]

Origen, Comment. in Genes., vol. ii. p. 1.—"For *God did not begin to be a Father*, having been hindered from being so for a time, like human fathers, who must wait to be fathers; for if God was always perfect, and his power of being a Father was always present with him, and if it was good for him to be the Father of such a Son, why should he defer it, and deprive himself of the good from time to time, so to speak, when he might have been the Father of a Son, and was not? *And the same may be said concerning the Holy Ghost.*" [5]

[1] Quoniam autem ipse omnia fecit libere et quemadmodum voluit, ait iterum David: Deus autem noster in cœlis sursum et in terrâ, omnia quæcunque voluit, fecit. Altera autem sunt, quæ constituta sunt, ab eo qui constituit, et quæ facta sunt, ab eo qui fecit. Ipse enim infectus, et sine initio et sine fine et nullius indigens, ipse sibi sufficiens, et adhuc reliquis omnibus, ut sint, hoc ipsum præstans; quæ vero ab eo sunt facta initium sumserunt. Quæcunque autem initium sumserunt, et dissolutionem possunt percipere et subjecta sunt et indigent ejus, qui se fecit; necesse est omnimodo, ut differens vocabulum habeant apud eos etiam, qui vel modicum sensum in discernendo talia habent: ita ut is quidem, qui omnia fecerit, cum Verbo suo juste dicatur Deus et Dominus solus; quæ autem facta sunt, non jam ejusdem vocabuli participabilia esse, neque juste id vocabulum sumere debere, quod est creatoris.

[2] *Ω θαύματος μυστικοῦ· εἷς μὲν ὁ τῶν ὅλων Πατήρ· εἷς δὲ καὶ ὁ τῶν ὅλων Λόγος· καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἕν, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ πανταχοῦ.*

[3] Et bene, qui dixit ipsum immensum Patrem in Filio mensuratum: mensura enim Patris, Filius, quoniam et capit eum.

[4] Quoniam Verbum, id est Filius, semper cum Patre erat, per multa demonstravimus. Quoniam autem et Sapientia, quæ est Spiritus, erat apud eum ante omnem constitutionem, per Salomonem ait.

[5] *Οὐ γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς Πατὴρ εἶναι ἤρξατο, κωλυόμενος ὡς οἱ γινόμενοι πατέρες*

De Principiis, IV. § 28.—"But this very expression of ours, that there never was a time when (the Son) was not, must be received with allowance (for the imperfection of language). For these very words 'never' and 'when' are significant of a temporal duration; but those things, which are predicated of the Father and the Son and the Holy Ghost, must be understood as above all time, above all ages, and above all eternity. For that only is the Trinity, which exceeds not only all meaning of a temporal nature, but even of an eternal. But other things which do not belong to the Trinity are to be measured by ages and times." [1]

So the Father is God, the Son is God: and the Holy Ghost is God.

Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, § 10.—"Who then would not be perplexed on hearing us called *atheists*: confessing as we do, God the Father, and God the Son, and the Holy Ghost; discovering their power in their unity, and their distinction in their order?" [2]

§ 24.—"We acknowledge God, and the Son his Word, and the Holy Ghost, united in power, being Father, Son, and Spirit: for the Son of the Father is Mind, the Word, Wisdom; and the Spirit is an emanation, as light from fire." [3]

Hippolytus, Contra Noetum, § xii.—"Wherefore we behold the Word incarnate; and we know the Father through him; and we believe in the Son; and we worship the Holy Ghost." [4]

ἄνθρωποι, ὑπὸ τοῦ μη δύνασθαί πω πατέρες εἶναι· εἰ γὰρ ἀεὶ τέλειος ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ πάρεστιν αὐτῷ δύναμις τοῦ Πατέρα αὐτὸν εἶναι, καὶ καλὸν αὐτὸν εἶναι Πατέρα τοῦ τοιούτου Υἱοῦ, τί ἀναβάλλεται, καὶ ἑαυτὸν τοῦ καλοῦ στηρίσκει, καὶ, ὡς ἔστιν εἰπεῖν, ἐξ οὗ δύναται Πατὴρ εἶναι Υἱοῦ; τὸ αὐτὸ μέντοιγε καὶ περὶ τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος λεκτέον.

[1] Hoc autem ipsum quod dicimus, quia nunquam fuit quando non fuit, cum venia audiendum est. Nam et hæc ipsa nomina temporalis vocabuli significationem gerunt, id est quando vel nunquam; supra omne autem tempus, et supra omnia sæcula, et supra omnem æternitatem intelligenda sunt ea quæ de Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto dicuntur. Hæc enim sola Trinitas est quæ omnem sensum intelligentiæ non solum temporalis verum etiam æternalis excedit. Cætera vero quæ sunt extra Trinitatem in sæculis et temporibus metienda sunt.

[2] *Τίς οὖν οὐκ ἀπορήσαι, λέγοντας Θεὸν Πατέρα καὶ Υἱὸν Θεὸν καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, δεικνύντας αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ ἑνώσει δύναμιν, καὶ τὴν ἐν τῇ τάξει διαίρεσιν, ἀκούσας ἀθέους καλουμένους;*

[3] *Ὡς γὰρ Θεὸν φαμὲν, καὶ Υἱὸν τὸν Λόγον αὐτοῦ καὶ Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ἑνούμενα μὲν κατὰ δύναμιν, τὸν Πατέρα, τὸν Υἱὸν, τὸ Πνεῦμα, ὅτι νοῦς, λόγος, σοφία, Υἱὸς τοῦ Πατρὸς, καὶ ἀπόῤῥοια, ὡς φῶς ἀπὸ πυρὸς, τὸ Πνεῦμα.*

[4] *Οὐκοῦν ἔνσαρκον Λόγον θεωροῦμεν, Πατέρα δι' αὐτοῦ νοοῦμεν, Υἱῷ δὲ πιστεύομεν, Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ προσκυνοῦμεν.*—Apud Routh. Opusc. tom. i. p. 68.

Origen, Comment. in Joannem.—"The laver of water is a symbol of the purification of the soul, which has all the filth contracted by sin washed away: nevertheless, for him who gives himself up to the *Divinity of the adorable Trinity*, through the power of invocations, it has of itself the beginning and fountain of graces." [1]

Comment. in Epist. ad Romanos.—"The sacred powers are capable of being the receptacles of the Only Begotten, and of the *Divinity of the Holy Spirit*." [2]

De Principiis, II. c. vii. § 3.—"But those (heretics), such is the slowness of their understandings—for they are not only unable to explain what is right, but cannot even lend an ear to the things which are said by us—thinking more lowly than they ought of *his Divinity* (*i.e.* the Divinity of the Holy Ghost), have abandoned themselves to errors and deceptions." [3]

Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. xiii. (Praxeas had objected that if it was God who gave the command for the creation, and as John says, the Word who executed the command was God, there must be two Gods. In the course of Tertullian's reply to this, there occurs,) "We never give utterance to the expression two Gods or two Lords; not, however, as though the Father were not God, and the Son God, and the Holy Ghost God, and each of them God." [4]

Like as we are compelled by the Christian verity: to acknowledge every Person by himself to be God and Lord;

So are we forbidden by the Catholic Religion: to say, There be three Gods, or three Lords.

Irenæus, III. c. viii. § 3.—"For he (the Father) is *not made*, and is without beginning, and without end, and is in need of nothing,

The Father is made of none: neither created, nor begotten.

[1] Τὸ τοῦ ὕδατος λουτρὸν σύμβολον τυγχάνει καθαρσίου ψυχῆς, πάντα ῥύπον τὸν ἀπὸ κακίας ἀποπλυναμένης· οὐδὲν δὲ ἧττον καὶ καθ' ἑαυτὸ, τῷ ἐμπαρέχοντι ἑαυτὸν τῇ θεότητι τῆς προσκυνήτης Τριάδος, διὰ τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν ἐπικλήσεων, χαρισμάτων ἀρχὴν ἔχει καὶ πηγήν.

[2] Αἱ ἱεραὶ δυνάμεις χωρητικαὶ τοῦ Μονογενοῦς, καὶ τῆς τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος θεότητος. These passages of Origen are preserved in Basil, De Spiritu Sancto, c. xxix.

[3] Isti vero pro imperitiâ sui intellectus, quia non solum ipsi quod rectum est consequenter non valent exponere, sed ne his quidem quæ a nobis dicuntur, possunt audientiam commodare, minora quam dignum est de ejus divinitate sentientes, erroribus se ac deceptionibus tradiderunt.

There is reason to think this passage correctly rendered, from the correspondence of its expression with that of the two last quotations, which are in the original Greek.

[4] Duos tamen Deos et duos Dominos nunquam ex ore nostro proferimus: non quasi non et Pater Deus, et Filius Deus, et Spiritus sanctus Deus, et Deus unusquisque.

and sufficeth for himself, and furnishes moreover to all other things this property, viz. that they exist." [1]

The Son is of the Father alone: not made, nor created, but begotten.

Justin Martyr, Dial. § 129.—"You will have perceived then, O hearers, if you have paid any attention at all, that Scripture declares this offspring to have been *begotten of the Father absolutely before all worlds*; and every one must confess, that that which is begotten is numerically different from that which begets." [2]

Irenæus, II. c. xxviii. § 6.—"If any one then shall say to us, How is the Son produced by the Father? We reply to him, that no one knows his emission, or generation, or nuncupation, or revelation, or by whatever other name you may call his ineffable generation; neither Valentinus, nor Marcion, nor Saturninus, nor Basilides, nor angels, nor archangels, nor princes, nor powers, but God only who begat him, and the Son who was begotten." [3]

The Holy Ghost is of the Father, and of the Son: neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding.

Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. iv.—"But when I derive the Son from no other quarter, than from the substance of the Father; when he does nothing without the Father's will, and derives all power from the Father; how can I be said to be driving the Monarchy of God out of the Creed; that Monarchy, which as it was committed to the Son by the Father, so do I preserve it in the Son? And let me add this as to the third order, that I do not consider the Spirit to be derived from any other quarter, than from the Father through the Son." [4]

[1] Ipse enim infectus et sine initio et sine fine et nullius indigens, ipse sibi sufficiens et adhuc reliquis omnibus, ut sint, hoc ipsum præstans.

[2] Νοεῖτε, ὦ ἀκροαταί, εἴ γε καὶ τὸν νοῦν προσέχετε, καὶ ὅτι γεγεννῆσθαι ὑπὸ τοῦ Πατρὸς τοῦτο τὸ γέννημα πρὸ πάντων ἁπλῶς τῶν κτισμάτων ὁ λόγος ἐδήλου, καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον τοῦ γεννῶντος ἀριθμῷ ἕτερόν ἐστι πᾶς ὁστισοῦν ὁμολογήσειε.

[3] Si quis itaque nobis dixerit: Quomodo ergo Filius prolatus a Patre est? dicimus ei, quia prolationem istam, sive generationem, sive nuncupationem, sive adapertionem, aut quolibet quis nomine vocaverit generationem ejus inenarrabilem exsistentem nemo novit; non Valentinus, non Marcion, neque Saturninus, neque Basilides, neque angeli, neque archangeli, neque principes, neque potestates, nisi solus qui generavit Pater et qui natus est Filius.

[4] Cæterum, qui Filium non aliunde deduco, sed de substantiâ Patris, nihil facientem sine Patris voluntate, omnem a Patre consecutum potestatem, quomodo possum de fide destruere monarchiam, quam a Patre traditam in Filio servo? Hoc mihi et in tertium gradum dictum sit, quia Spiritum non aliunde puto, quam a Patre per Filium.

c. viii.—"Whatever proceeds from another must be second to that from which it proceeds, yet it is not on that account separated from it. But where there is a second there must be two; and where there is a third, there are three. For the Spirit is a third from God and the Son; as the fruit is third from the branch and from the root; the river third from the stream and from the fountain; the sparkle from the ray and from the sun. Nothing, however, assumes a nature alien to that from which it derives its properties. Thus, the Trinity, proceeding through close and connected gradations from the Father, is not opposed to the Monarchy, and leaves the condition of the economy undamaged." [1]

Adv. Hermogenem, c. vii.—"For the Godhead has not degrees, forasmuch as it is One." [2]

And in this Trinity none is afore or after other: none is greater or less than another.

Origen, De Principiis, I. c. iii. § 7.—"Lest, however, any one should think that, because we say the Holy Ghost is given to the saints only, whilst the blessings and operations of the Father and the Son are experienced by the good and bad, the just and unjust, we hereby set the Holy Ghost before the Father and the Son, or affirm his dignity to be greater; this is by no means a consequence. For we have simply been describing the peculiar character of his grace and agency. But *in the Trinity nothing must be said to be greater or less*, since the fountain of the one Godhead grasps the world by his Word and Reason, and sanctifies by the Spirit of his mouth whatever is worthy of sanctification." [3]

[1] Omne quod prodit ex aliquo, secundum sit ejus necesse est de quo prodit, non ideo tamen est separatum. Secundus autem ubi est, duo sunt. Et tertius ubi est, tres sunt. Tertius enim est Spiritus a Deo et Filio, sicut tertius a radice fructus ex fructice. Et tertius a fonte, rivus ex flumine. Et tertius a sole, apex ex radio. Nihil tamen a matrice alienatur, a quâ proprietates suas ducit. Ita Trinitas per consertos et connexos gradus a Patre decurrens, et monarchiæ nihil obstrepit, et œconomiæ statum protegit.

[2] Divinitas autem gradum non habet, utpote unica.

[3] Ne quis sane existimet nos ex eo quod diximus Spiritum sanctum solis sanctis præstari, Patris vero et Filii beneficia vel inoperationes pervenire et bonos et malos, justos et injustos, prætulisse per hoc Patri et Filio Spiritum sanctum, vel majorem ejus per hoc asserere dignitatem; quod utique valde inconsequens est. Proprietatem namque gratiæ ejus operisque descripsimus. Porro autem nihil in Trinitate majus minusve dicendum est, quum unius

Contra Celsum, VIII. § 12.—"We then *worship* the *Father* of truth; and the *Son* who is truth, being two in Person, but one in unanimity, in symphony, in identity of will."[1]

So that in all things, as is aforesaid: the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity is to be *worshipped.*

Tertullian, De Oratione, c. xii.—"Nor ought earnest prayer merely to be clear of all angry feeling, but even of every commotion of mind; for it should be sent forth from a spirit like unto that *Spirit unto whom it is sent.* For a spirit that is defiled will not be acknowledged by *the Holy Spirit,* nor the sad by the cheerful, nor the bond by the free."[2]

Justin Martyr, Dial. § 71.—"I would have you to know, that they have altogether expunged many passages from the translation of the Septuagint, wherein it might be clearly shown that this same (Jesus) who was crucified, was both God and man."[3]

Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation: that he also believe rightly the Incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Dial. § 87.—"Now confessing that these things were spoken of Christ, you still affirm that he pre-existed as God, and that he took flesh according to the will of God, and was made man of a virgin."[4]

For the right Faith is, that we believe and confess: that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is God and Man;

God, of the Substance of the Father, begotten before the worlds: and Man, of the Substance of his Mother, born in the world;

Origen, Contra Celsum, I. § 60.—"And they brought gifts such as they might offer symbolically to a Being, so to speak, compounded of God and mortal man; gold, as to a king; myrrh, as to one about to die; incense, as to God."[5]

Divinitatis fons Verbo ac Ratione suâ teneat universa, Spiritu vero oris sui quæ digna sunt sanctificatione, sanctificet.

[1] Θρησκεύομεν οὖν τὸν Πατέρα τῆς ἀληθείας, καὶ τὸν Υἱὸν τὴν ἀληθείαν, ὄντα δύο τῇ ὑποστάσει πράγματα, ἓν δὲ τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ, καὶ τῇ συμφωνίᾳ, καὶ τῇ ταυτότητι τοῦ βουλήματος.

[2] Nec ab irâ solummodo, sed omni omnino confusione animi libera debet esse orationis intentio, de tali spiritu emissa, qualis est Spiritus, ad quem mittitur. Neque enim agnosci poterit a Spiritu Sancto spiritus inquinatus; aut tristis a læto, aut impeditus a libero.

[3] Καὶ ὅτι πολλὰς γραφὰς τέλεον περιεῖλον ἀπὸ τῶν ἐξηγήσεων τῶν γεγενημένων ὑπο τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίῳ γεγενημένων πρεσβυτέρων, ἐξ ὧν διαῤῥήδην οὗτος αὐτὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὅτι Θεὸς καὶ ἄνθρωπος καὶ σταυρούμενος καὶ ἀποθνήσκων κεκηρυγμένος ἀποδείκνυται, εἰδέναι ὑμᾶς βούλομαι.

[4] Καὶ ὁμολογήσας ταῦτα . . . εἰς Χριστὸν εἰρῆσθαι, καὶ Θεὸν αὐτὸν προϋπάρχοντα λέγεις, καὶ κατὰ τὴν βουλὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντα αὐτὸν λέγεις διὰ τῆς παρθένου γεγεννῆσθαι ἄνθρωπον.

[5] Φέροντες μὲν δῶρα, ἃ (ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω) συνθέτῳ τινὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ καὶ

Melito, De Incarnatione Christi.—"The same being God and also perfect man."[1]

Perfect God, and perfect Man: of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting.

Hippolytus, Contra Beronem et Helicem, p. 226.—"Being and thought to be at once the Infinite God, and circumscribed man, having the perfect being of both perfectly."[2]

Origen, De Principiis, II. c. vi. § 3.—"This substance then of the soul mediating between God and flesh (for it was not possible that the nature of God should be mingled with body without a mediator), there is born, as we have said, God-man; that substance being the medium, its nature not being opposed to the assumption of a body."[3]

§ 5.—"But if it should appear to any one to be a difficulty, that we assign a reasonable soul to Christ, and in all our arguments represent the nature of the soul as capable of good and evil, that difficulty may be thus explained."[4]

Ignatius, Ad Ephesios, § vii.—"There is *one* physician fleshly and spiritual, made and not made, God born in the flesh, true life in death, both of Mary and of God, first capable of suffering, and then incapable."[5]

Who although he be God and Man: yet he is not two, but one Christ.

Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. xxvii.—"We must inquire about this; how the Word was made flesh; whether as transfigured into flesh, or as putting on flesh? Certainly he *must have put on flesh.* For we must consider God to be immutable and incapable of taking shape, as being eternal. But transfiguration is the extinction of the previous estate.

One; not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh: but by taking of the Manhood into God;

ἀνθρώπου θνητοῦ προσήνεγκαν σύμβολα μὲν, ὡς βασιλεῖ τὸν χρυσὸν, ὡς δὲ τεθνηξομένῳ τὴν σμύρναν, ὡς δὲ Θεῷ τὸν λιβανωτόν.

[1] Θεὸς ὢν ὁμοῦ τε καὶ ἄνθρωπος τέλειος ὁ αὐτός.—Apud Routh. Reliq. Sacr. vol. i. p. 115.

[2] Θεὸν ἄπειρον ὁμοῦ καὶ περιγραπτὸν ἄνθρωπον ὄντα τε καὶ νοούμενον, τὴν οὐσίαν ἑκατέρου τελείως τελείαν ἔχοντα.

[3] Hâc ergo substantiâ animæ inter Deum carnemque mediante (non enim possibile erat Dei naturam corpori sine mediatore misceri) nascitur, ut diximus, Deus homo, illâ substantiâ mediâ existente, cui utique contra naturam non erat corpus assumere.

[4] Quod si alicui difficile videbitur, pro eo quod rationabilem animam esse in Christo supra ostendimus, quum utique animarum naturam boni malique capacem per omnes disputationes nostras frequenter ostendimus, hoc modo rei hujus explanabitur difficultas.

[5] Εἷς ἰατρός ἐστιν, σαρκικός τε καὶ πνευματικὸς, γεννητὸς καὶ ἀγέννητος, ἐν σαρκὶ γενόμενος Θεὸς, ἐν ἀθανάτῳ ζωὴ ἀληθινὴ, καὶ ἐκ Μαρίας καὶ ἐκ Θεοῦ, πρῶτον παθητὸς καὶ τότε ἀπαθής.

For whatever is transfigured into something else, ceases to be what it had been, and begins to be what it was not. But God cannot cease to be, nor can he be different from what he was."[1]

Origen, Contra Celsum, III. § 41.—"Let those, however, who accuse us know, that he whom we believe and are persuaded to have been God from the beginning and the Son of God, the same is the very Word, very Wisdom, and very Truth. And we say that his mortal body, and the human soul within it, not merely by communion with him, but by union and commixture, acquired the highest gifts, and that *sharing his Divinity they passed into God.*"[2]

Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. xxvii.—"The Word was no other than God: the flesh no other than man. . . . . It is a double estate, *not by confusion*, but *by conjunction in one Person*, of God and the man Jesus."[3]

One altogether; not by confusion of Substance: but by Unity of Person.

Such is the clear complexion of the testimony borne by the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the doctrine of the Trinity. Such the impression which their writings convey in the gross to the careful reader of them. He would rise from them with the conviction fixed in his mind that they held substantially the faith set forth in the Athanasian Creed; however particular phrases may have presented themselves to him, from time to time, which seemed repugnant to it—a circumstance which he will account for partly from the loose mode of expressing themselves, which untutored theologians were content to adopt, partly from the extreme difficulty of finding words exactly adapted to the ideas, and such as should not impart defective

[1] De hoc quærendum, quomodo Sermo caro sit factus; utrumne quasi transfiguratus in carne, an indutus carnem? Immo indutus. Cæterum, Deum immutabilem et informabilem credi necesse est, ut æternum. Transfiguratio autem interemptio est pristini. Omne enim quodcunque transfiguratur in aliud, desinit esse quod fuerat, et incipit esse quod non erat. Deus autem neque desinit esse, neque aliud potest esse.

[2] Ὅμως δὲ ἴστωσαν οἱ ἐγκαλοῦντες, ὅτι ὃν μὲν νομίζομεν, καὶ πεπείσμεθα ἀρχῆθεν εἶναι Θεὸν καὶ Υἱὸν Θεοῦ, οὗτος ὁ αὐτολόγος ἐστὶ καὶ ἡ αὐτοσοφία καὶ ἡ αὐτὸ ἀληθεία· τὸ δὲ θνητὸν αὐτοῦ σῶμα, καὶ τὴν ἀνθρωπίνην ἐν αὐτῷ ψυχὴν, τῇ πρὸς ἐκεῖνον οὐ μόνον κοινωνίᾳ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑνώσει καὶ ἀνακράσει τὰ μέγιστά φαμεν προσειληφέναι, καὶ τῆς ἐκείνου θεότητος κεκοινωνηκότα εἰς Θεὸν μεταβεβηκέναι.

[3] Quia neque Sermo aliud quam Deus, neque caro aliud quam homo . . . . Videmus duplicem statum non confusum, sed conjunctum in unâ personâ, Deum et hominem Jesum.

notions of the Godhead, owing to the material sense in which they were ordinarily used: but, above all, from the mystery of the subject itself, one so far surpassing the capacity of man. The whole question, therefore, had to be filtered in Councils, even as the question of the circumcision of the Gentiles was debated and the decree issued accordingly in those remarkable terms, "It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us."[1] In the meantime we must be prepared to see the doctrine in the ore, if I may so speak, encumbered with dross. Hence the several expressions which Arians and other schismatics press into their service, deriving from them, taken singly and alone, arguments for their dogmas the most plausible, and which sciolists in these matters repeat with triumph; but which, upon minds thoroughly imbued with the spirit of these authors and intimately conversant with their works, produce no effect at all.

Thus, in spite of the substance of the Athanasian Creed manifested as I have shown it to be in the writings of the Primitive Fathers, you will find it nevertheless said by one or other of them, on one or other occasion, that the Son has the second place, the Holy Ghost the third[2]; that the Son ministers to the Father[3]; that God was the Author of the power, divinity, and even salvation of the Son[4]; that he was Wisdom, the second person *created*, in allusion to Proverbs viii. 22 (LXX)[5]; that he was first created by God to plan, then generated to execute[6]; that there was a treatise written by one of them, "Concerning the Creation and Generation of Christ"[7] that the Father is known by himself more intimately than he is known by the Son[8]; that we are not to pray to Christ, but only to God the Father through Christ[9]; that God the Father rules the Saviour[10]; that the Son was the oldest of created things[11]; and much more to the like effect. These latter passages are all of them from Origen, from whom alone might be collected more expressions of this unguarded kind than from any other Ante-Nicene Father, or, perhaps, all

[1] Acts xv. 28.
[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 13.
[3] Dial. § 60.
[4] §§ 102. 129.
[5] Tertullian, Adv. Praxeam, c. vi.
[6] c. vii.
[7] Melito, ap. Routh. Rel. Sacr. vol. i. p. 114.
[8] Origen, De Principiis, IV. § 35.
[9] De Oratione, § 15.
[10] Contra Celsum. VIII. § 15.
[11] *Πρεσβύτατον γὰρ αὐτὸν πάντων*

the Ante-Nicene Fathers put together. And yet it would be easy to produce others from him (often scores of them, many I have produced already) diametrically opposed in meaning to that which any or all of these seem to bear; and it may be observed as a very frequent argument on this subject, that throughout his book against Celsus, Origen evidently considers that every objection which Celsus can raise against Christianity, founded on difficulties resulting from the doctrine of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, was a legitimate objection, and required an answer; a line of defence which he would never have adopted had he felt himself in a condition to dispute or to deny the premises; and a great number of such objections Celsus actually does advance.[1]

It would seem, therefore, that in the instance of Origen more than the usual causes to which I have adverted must have operated to produce so large a proportion of blemishes; that there must have been more disturbing forces acting on his theology, as it has reached us at least, than appears at first sight. We may trace several such from evidence contained in his own writings. First, it appears that he was much resorted to by philosophers and heretics; that he held conferences with them and studied their works.[2] It is possible that this communication left some tokens of itself behind on his book. Secondly, it is clear that he often wrote in haste, and on the move, both time and place against him; that under such disadvantages, for example, he penned his Epistle to Africanus on the authority of the history of Susanna, which he composed, he says, at a short notice, when sojourning for a few days at Nicomedia, and for the defects of which he begs his correspondent's indulgence on this very ground; and it may be added, that the history which he here defends in his haste as canonical, he elsewhere in his haste seems disposed to abandon.[3] And when speaking of a certain diagram of which Celsus had made use, he avers that he could find no key to it anywhere, many as were the parts

τῶν δημιουργημάτων ἴσασιν οἱ θεῖοι λόγοι.—V. § 37. This is the passage apparently referred to by Dr. Clarke, and overlooked by Dr. Burton. See Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ, p. 300, 2nd Ed.

[1] See especially II. § 17, *et seq.*

[2] Ex Origenis Epistolâ, vol. i. p. 4.

[3] Fragm. ex libro decimo Stromatum Origenis, vol. i. p. 40.

of the earth over which he had travelled, as though it was his habit to prosecute his studies on the wing.[1] And in the construction of his work against this same Celsus, he discovers in a still more remarkable manner this habit of precipitation; for though he eventually took more pains, perhaps, with this work, than with any other he composed, or, at least, any other that has descended to us, yet having commenced it on one plan, and soon finding it expedient to continue it on another, he could not prevail on himself to recast the beginning, but retained it as it was, for the sake of expedition and economy of time; and apologized in a preface to his readers for the incongruity it would occasion.[2] We may detect similar marks of hurry in the opening of the second book against Celsus, as compared with that of the third. For, whilst in the opening of the second, he professes to confine himself in that book to the charges which Celsus, in the fictitious character of a Jew, brings against the *Jews* who believed in Jesus; in the opening of the third, where he recapitulates the subjects of the two former books, he overlooks this limitation of the argument of the second, and says, "In the second we met, as well as we could, all the objections made against *us* who believe in God through Christ, by Celsus as a Jew."[3] Accordingly, it would seem that, in writing the second book, he did in fact forget the prospectus with which he started; the reasoning not having an exclusive reference to the Jewish believer; and in no single instance founded peculiarly on Hebrew criticism. Thirdly, it is plain that Origen propounded a great many of his notions as pure speculations, in which he had himself no particular confidence, the freaks of a mercurial mind, and represented by himself as little else. Thus he introduces his chapter "concerning the end," in his "De Principiis" with the remark, that what he was about to suggest "would be said with great fear and caution, rather in the spirit of one who discusses and debates a subject, than of one who ventures to affirm on it."[4] So in the next chapter, "concerning things corporeal and incorporeal," when launching into a disquisition on the nature of the heavenly bodies, or on the probability of their being ani-

[1] Contra Celsum, VI. § 24.
[2] Præf. ad libros contra Celsum, § 6.
[3] Compare II. § 1, and III. § 1.
[4] Quæ quidem a nobis cum magno metu et cautelâ dicuntur, discutientibus magis et pertractantibus quam pro certo ac definito statuentibus.—De Principiis, I. c. vi. § 1.

mated, he adds: "Although to institute such an inquiry as this may seem to have in it a certain audacity, still, since we are impelled by the desire of laying hold of truth, it does not seem absurd to examine and try such matters as it may be possible to attain unto, according to the grace of the Holy Spirit."[1] Again, "concerning the Incarnation of Christ," we find him preparing his readers for his remarks by the following appeal: "Touching which, we will produce as briefly as possible, not with any temerity, but simply because the course of our subject calls for it, the things which our faith rather holds than those which human reason dogmatically asserts for itself; rather advancing our own suspicions than making any positive assertions."[2] Again, in the same chapter, "Meanwhile this is what has occurred to us at present, whilst discussing so difficult a subject as the Incarnation and Divinity of Christ. If, however, any one can discover anything better, and confirm what he says by clearer arguments from the Holy Scriptures, let his conclusions be received rather than ours."[3] Again, in another chapter "concerning the soul," "However, as to what we have said touching the νοῦς (mens) of man, when changed for the worse, becoming a ψυχὴ (anima), or aught else pertaining to the same question, let him who reads diligently discuss the matters in his thoughts, and conclude on it; but let not what we have just put forward be understood as spoken dogmatically, but rather as produced in the way of discussion and inquiry."[4] Again, in another chapter "concerning human temptations," Origen starts various theories to account for "the flesh lusting against the spirit," and then concludes, "The reader may choose which theory he likes

[1] Quamvis hoc inquirere audaciæ cujusdam videatur, quoniam tamen captandæ veritatis studio provocamur, quæ possibilia nobis sunt, secundum gratiam Spiritus sancti scrutari et pertentare non videtur absurdum.—De Principiis, I. vii. § 3.

[2] De quo nos non temeritate aliquâ, sed quoniam ordo loci deposcit, ea magis quæ fides nostra continet, quam quæ humanæ rationis assertio vindicare solet, quam paucissimis proferemus, suspiciones potius nostras quam manifestas aliquas affirmationes in medium proferentes.—II. c. vi. § 2.

[3] Hæc interim nobis ad præsens de rebus tam difficilibus disputantibus, id est de incarnatione, et de deitate Christi occurrere potuerunt. Si quis sane melius aliquid poterit invenire, et evidentioribus de scripturis sanctis assertionibus confirmare quæ dicit, illa potius quam hæc recipiantur.—II. c. vi. § 7.

[4] Verum tamen quod diximus, mentem in animam verti, vel si qua alia in hoc videntur aspicere, discutiat apud se qui legit diligentius et pertractet: a nobis tamen non putentur velut dogmata esse prolata, sed tractandi more ac requirendi esse discussa.—II. c. viii. § 4.

best."[1] And once more, in a chapter "concerning the end of the world," Origen closes his lucubrations, "Having thus far discussed the system of corporeal nature or spiritual body, we leave the matter to the judgment of the reader, that he may choose whichever theory he likes best; and so we make an end of our third book."[2] These passages, though taken from the "De Principiis," I have no doubt are correct versions of the Greek; for besides being of a kind to provoke no meddling of Rufinus, they are perfectly consistent with other places still existing in the Greek. Thus he ends a comment on the question of ecclesiastical Digamy as follows: "It is probable that other notions will be started by persons much wiser than ourselves, and better able to see into such things, whether as relates to the law touching the writing of divorcement, or whether as to the Apostolical precepts, which forbid Digamists to have any rule in the Church, or to preside over it in any post of honour: we, however, have expressed what has occurred to ourselves on this subject, waiting till something better can be made out, and something which, by the superior lustre of knowledge, may eclipse what has been said by us."[3] I have multiplied these quotations, because I think they throw a light on the character of Origen's writings; and supply a key to much that is otherwise perplexing in them.

All these circumstances, then, taken into account, we might expect that the works of Origen, even as they came fresh from his pen, would exhibit many of those symptoms of heat and confusion which certainly appear in them at present, and we might be disposed to think that there never was a time, even from their first publication, when they could be adopted as safe and consistent guides from beginning to end; however particular treatises might justly be thought such; and however cognisable, after all, the fundamental features of the truth and of the Church might be, and indeed still are, throughout them as a whole.

But even these drawbacks to the implicit reception of them

[1] Et nos quidem prout potuimus ex singulorum personis quæ dici possunt disputationis modo de singulis dogmatibus in medium protulimus: qui autem legit, eligat ex his quæ magis amplectenda sit ratio.—III. c. iv. § 5.

[2] Hactenus nobis etiam corporeæ naturæ vel spiritalis corporis ratione discussâ, arbitrio legentis relinquimus, ex utroque quod melius judicaverit eligendum. Nos vero in his finem libri tertii faciamus.—c. vi. § 9.

[3] Origen, Comment. in Matt. tom. xiv. § 22, vol. iii. p. 646.

are aggravated by other considerations. We have not, in many cases, the work as Origen composed it—if the original concoction had its alloy, the mixture which has resulted from subsequent vitiation of it is much more debased. In the first place, the text is corrupt; how much so, and how much might be done to correct it, may be perceived by comparing that of the treatise "De Oratione," as revised by Bentley, with that which he found it. But the grievance lies deeper even than this. Origen was himself careless about his manuscripts. On one occasion he tells us of a heretic who, having held a dispute with him, availed himself of the notes of it which had been taken down by the bystanders, and then dressing them up to suit his purpose, gave them circulation as a treatise of Origen's. Meanwhile, his friends, shocked at the publication, apply to him for the authentic copy, which, says Origen, though it had never been read over by him or revised, but had been thrown aside, so that it was with difficulty recovered, he at length found and sent them.[1] It is possible that several of his treatises, as we now possess them, are not the deliberate penning of Origen himself, but memoranda of oral addresses, committed to paper by his hearers, in the manner here alluded to; a process sure to misrepresent him more or less.[2] And it is certain, that in the very earliest times his writings were tampered with by heretics. His "De Principiis," which is said to have suffered in this way above the rest, underwent further manipulations at the hands of Rufinus (as he himself confesses[3]) in his translation of it, in which alone the greater part of it has been preserved to us; and which must be estimated accordingly: for though the substance of it is, no doubt, Origen's; and may often be confirmed as being so by a reference to similar opinions expressed in other of his works; yet the liberties taken with it may sometimes involve Origen in contradictions, which are not really to be laid at his door. And in the Comment on the Epistle to the Romans, which also has descended to us only in the Latin version of Rufinus, the translator tells us in his Preface that he made bold with his author in the same way.[4] I have entered into these details for the purpose of

[1] Ex Epist. Origenis, vol. i. p. 5.
[2] See Eusebius, Eccles. Hist. vi. c. 36.
[3] Origen, Prologus Rufini in libros περὶ ἀρχῶν.
[4] Vol. iv. p. 458.

accounting for the number of expressions occurring in Origen's writings, as we now have them, which jar with the general tone of his teaching; a number much greater in proportion than those of a like kind, which present themselves to us in any other of the Ante-Nicene Fathers.

LECTURE XI.

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Socinian scheme. 3°. On the doctrine of the Atonement. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. The death of Christ, according to the Fathers, a sacrifice—expiatory, vicarious, universally necessary. Unreasonableness and hardihood of rejecting a doctrine thus guaranteed. 4°. On the nature and effect of Baptism. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. Unanimity of the Fathers on Baptismal regeneration. Variety of forms in which they assert it. The effect of Baptism, according to them, the work of the Holy Ghost. Their account of it meant to apply to infants as well as to adults. Evidence for Infant Baptism. The office of sponsors recognised. The benefit not ascribed to the *opus operatum*, but represented as contingent on the observance of the Baptismal promises. Strictness of the early Church in this particular.

§ 3.

On the Doctrine of the Atonement.

THE next great doctrine on which the testimony of the early Fathers is directly opposed to the Socinian scheme, and which has already been incidentally touched in one or two quotations made for other purposes, is that of the *Atonement* by the Blood of Christ. The Racovian Catechism, after assigning as causes for the death of the Saviour, that it was necessary in order to his subsequent resurrection and exaltation, and as a proof of God's love and Christ's own towards us, proceeds to ask, "Is there not some other cause for the death of Christ?" To which it makes answer, "None at all; although Christians at this day commonly think that Christ by his death merited salvation for us, and fully satisfied for our sins, which opinion is fallacious, erroneous, and very pernicious."[1] And Dr. Priestley, a leader of a section of the same school in modern times, affirms that "The whole doctrine of the Atonement, with every modification of it, has been a departure from Primitive Christianity."[2]

[1] Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. viii.

[2] History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. i. p. 154.

Now certainly if the unanimous voice of the early Church is to rule us at all in the interpretation we put upon Scripture, it is clear that neither the Catechism of Socinus, nor the dogma of the disciple of Socinus, is to be received for a moment. The array of authorities which might be produced from the Fathers in support of this assertion is absolutely overwhelming. One knows not which to select, or where to stop in the selection.

We find Barnabas seeing in the Law intimations that "The Lord was eventually to offer up his flesh (the receptacle of his Spirit) *as a sacrifice for our sins;*"[1] that when the heifer was burned, the ashes put into vessels, and the people sprinkled with the ashes that they might be *purified from their sins*, the heifer meant Christ.[2]

We find Clemens Romanus saying that the spies required of Rahab a sign, namely, "that she should hang a purple thread out of her house, thereby signifying that there would be redemption through the blood of the Lord for all who believe and hope in God."[3] We perceive him applying the language of the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah to Christ, "He was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities, the chastisement of our peace was upon him, and with his stripes we are healed."[4] We have him declaring that "Through the charity which Jesus Christ our Lord felt for us he gave his blood for us; his flesh for our flesh; his life for our lives."[5]

We hear Ignatius talk of "*purging the water* (*i. e.* of Baptism) *by his Passion*"[6]; boast that "the archives which he for his part consulted were those uncorrupted ones of the *cross, death*, resurrection of Christ, and faith in him, by whom he hoped to be justified."[7]

We discover Justin Martyr speaking of the death of Christ, not as an event which "Procured the reversion of death passed upon Adam and his posterity at the Fall, and so the resurrection of mankind in general, the wicked as well as the righteous to a future life," which was what Dr. Priestley saw in it,[8] but as a sacrifice expurgatory of moral guilt. By the

[1] Barnabas, § 7.
[2] § 8.
[3] Clem. Rom. Ad Corinth. I. § xii.
[4] § xvi.
[5] § xlix.
[6] Ignatius, Ad Ephes. § xviii.
[7] Ad Philadelph. § viii.
[8] History of the Corruptions of Christianity, vol. i. p. 237.

serpent on the pole or cross in the wilderness, "It was proclaimed that the power of the serpent which wrought the fall of Adam was dissolved, and that there was *salvation* for those who believed in him whom the cross expressed, from *the wounds of the serpent*, which are evil deeds, idolatries, and other iniquities."[1] "The Father of all chose that his Christ should *take on himself the universal curse for all men of every nation*."[2] The prophecy of Jacob pointed to "The passion which Christ should undergo, when he would *purge by his blood* those who believed in him;"[3] the word καθαίρειν, (and the same may be said of καθαρίζειν in a previous quotation from Ignatius,) evidently having a reference to the defiling quality of sin, which Christ came to put away by the sacrifice of himself; and not at all to the purpose, if by the offering of Christ nothing more was meant than his delivering himself to die as a preliminary to his entering into heaven, there to discharge his priestly functions for us[4]; or his reversing the sentence of death passed at the Fall, and procuring the resurrection of mankind. "Those who have not clean hands should *wash* and be *clean* . . . . not as though all the waters of the sea could cleanse sin, but as though the bath of salvation could . . . through faith in the blood of Christ;"[5] still ἀπολούεσθαι and καθαρίζειν the terms used; and in relation solely to the effect of the bloodshedding of Christ. Finally, the mystery contained in Joshua the high priest having his filthy garments taken from him, as recorded in the third chapter of Zechariah, was significant of our sins being put away from us through the name of Jesus.[6]

We find Irenæus, in his turn, insisting on the same doctrine over and over again, as if it was above all doubt or dispute, affirming that "The Lord suffered for our salvation;"[7] "ransomed us by his own blood;"[8] "redeemed us from the Fall by his blood, to the end that we might be a holy people;"[9] that he "reconciled us to God by his Passion;"[10] that he "called to him all that mourned, and gave remission of sins to those who had been led captive, and loosed them

[1] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 94.
[2] § 95.
[3] Apol. I. § 32.
[4] Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Priestly Office, pp. 163, 164.
[5] Justin Martyr, Dial. §§ 12, 13.
[6] §§ 115, 116.
[7] Irenæus, II. c. xx. § 2.
[8] V. c. i. § 1.
[9] III. c. v. § 3.
[10] III. c. xvi. § 9.

from their bonds;"[1] that "God made the Gentiles clean by the blood of his Son;"[2] that "he descended from the Father, took flesh, suffered death, and consummated the scheme of our salvation;"[3] that "David, when he said, Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth no sin, was setting forth beforehand the forgiveness through his advent, whereby he blotted out the hand-writing of our debt and nailed it to the cross; so that as by the tree we were made debtors to God, by the tree we should obtain remission of our debt;"[4] that "Jesus who *suffered for us*, who sojourned among us, the same is the Word of God;"[5] that "we should declare with thanksgiving wherefore the Word of God took flesh and suffered."[6]

We read in Melito[7] that "God suffered with Israel on his right hand," the Gentiles being on his left. How could such an awful phrase as this present itself, except to a mind conscious of the immense difficulty attending the expiation of sin, and the precious offering required in order to effect it? Indeed, the true nature of those sufferings is expressly asserted in the next fragment of the same author, taken from a catena or running commentary on Genesis—"There came a ram for the slaughter instead of Isaac the just man, that Isaac might be loosed from his bonds. This ram being put to death ransomed Isaac. In like manner the Lord being slain saved us, and being bound set us free, and being sacrificed became our ransom"[8]—where Christ's sacrifice is clearly designated as *vicarious*, Christ substituted in our stead as the ram was in Isaac's—an authority completely in contradiction to the Racovian Catechism, which, having asked the question, "What is the meaning of these words, that Christ died for us?" makes answer, "This expression, 'for us,' does not signify in our stead, but on our behalf."[9]

We observe that Clemens Alexandrinus, different as his mode of writing and reasoning is from that of the Fathers we have been hitherto considering, still agrees with them in giving clear expression to this fundamental doctrine. Like Melito, he finds the scene of Calvary in that of Mount

[1] Irenæus, III. c. ix. § 3.
[2] III. c. xii. § 7.
[3] III. c. xviii. § 2.
[4] V. c. xvii. § 3.
[5] I. c. ix. § 3.
[6] I. c. x. § 3.
[7] Routh. Rel. Sacr. vol. i. p. 116.
[8] Ibid. p. 117.
[9] Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. viii. p. 134.

Moriah—"Isaac was the son of Abraham, as Christ was the Son of God; he was a victim as the Lord was, yet was not offered up, as was the Lord; only Isaac bare the wood of the *sacrifice*, as the Lord bare the *cross*, and he laughed in a figure, prophesying that the Lord would fill us with joy, *redeemed as we are from destruction by the Lord's blood.* Isaac, however, did not actually suffer, which was well, for he resigned the initiative of the Passion to the Word. Moreover, by not being put to death he intimated the Divinity of the Lord; for Jesus after his burial rose again, not having suffered" (*i. e.* either not in his Godhead or not permanently) "even as Isaac was released from the sacrifice."[1] Again, how undeniably is the vicarious nature of Christ's sacrifice declared in the following paragraph, the very antithesis turning on it! "He who suffers for his love of God, suffers for his own salvation; and again, he who dies for his own salvation, endures for the love of the Lord. For he for whom he suffered being himself Life, was content to suffer, in *order that by his Passion we might live.*"[2] And the same may be said of this other, "I will give thee daily the drink of immortality," (it is the Saviour who is represented as speaking,) "I will be thy teacher in heavenly lore. I contended for thee unto death. *I paid thy death* which thou owedst for thy sins aforetime and for thy unfaithfulness unto God."[3] Once more, how universal is the necessity of this sacrifice! "The Apostle, though he had distinctly said already that he regards the salvation in Christ of the just (*i. e.* of the just who lived before Christ) and of us to be one and the same, nevertheless adds, when speaking of Moses, that he 'esteemed the reproach of Christ greater riches than the treasures of Egypt'"[4]—this again a sentiment altogether opposed to that of the same Catechism on the same subject; where to the question, "Is none justified without faith in Christ?" (*i. e.* however, a Socinian faith,) the answer supplied is, "None at all. But this is to be understood of that time since Christ hath been revealed . . . For as to the time that went before the revelation of Christ, this cannot be affirmed thereof."[5]

Nay more, as I argued in the last section, that the Trinita-

[1] Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. v. p. 111.
[2] Stromat. IV. § vii. p. 583.
[3] Quis dives salvetur, § xxiii.
[4] Stromat. IV. § xvi. p. 609.
[5] Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. xi. p. 152.

rian sense imposed by the early Fathers on texts which, strictly speaking, perhaps, could not be adduced in evidence of it, or where the correctness of such application might be disputed, served to show very clearly that the doctrine of the Trinity was in undisputed possession of their minds, so may I say the same with respect to the doctrine of the Atonement. Thus it is a well-known fancy of Barnabas, that when Abraham circumcised all the males in his house, being in number 318, thereby saving them from being cut off from the congregation, the incident typified the crucifixion of Jesus and its consequences—the 18 being expressed by the letters ι η, the initials of Jesus, and the 300 by the letter τ, the figure of the cross, so that the number 318 translated meant Jesus crucified.[1] No one would think of accepting this reasoning of Barnabas as sound and trustworthy, or be satisfied that the doctrine of Christ crucified and its results are fairly deduced from the premises; but every one would, nevertheless, draw this conclusion from the commentary of Barnabas, that the doctrine of the Atonement was considered by him to be a very prominent feature in the Gospel scheme, and to be true beyond denial; and this the rather from his daring to find it where he does. Had it been one of doubtful acceptance, he would not have ventured upon so questionable an expression of it; still less would this notion of his have maintained its ground so long as to be repeated by Clemens, and with as little misgiving as it had been broached by Barnabas.[2]

Tertullian adds his testimony to that of those we have already reviewed. "What, then," says he, in his "De Coronâ," "was the crown which Christ Jesus wore for either sex? It was a crown of thorns and briars, in token of *the sins* which the earth of our flesh hath brought forth unto us and which *the power of the cross hath taken away*, overcoming the sharpness of every sting of death in the sufferings of the head of the Lord."[3] How emphatic a declaration of the doctrine of the Atonement is contained in the following passage! How difficult would it be to devise expressions that should convey

[1] Barnabas, § 9.

[2] Clem. Alex. Stromat. VI. § xi. p. 781.

[3] Quale, oro te, sertum pro utroque sexu subiit? Ex spinis, opinor, et tribulis, in figuram delictorum, quæ nobis protulit terra carnis, abstulit autem virtus crucis, omnem aculeum mortis in Dominici capitis tolerantiâ obtundens.—Tertullian, De Coronâ, c. xiv.

it with greater authority! Tertullian is arguing against the early heretical notion that Jesus was merely a phantom, and in setting forth the consequences which would ensue from such a fact if it were true, There could be no such thing in that case, says he, as faith in Christ's passion, "because a phantasm could not really suffer; so that *the whole work of God would be overturned.* The death of Christ, *the whole weight and benefit of the Christian profession,* that death which the Apostle insists upon so impressively as real, making it *the entire foundation* of the Gospel, of our salvation, and of his preaching, would be denied; for 'I have delivered unto you,' says he, 'first of all how that Christ died for our sins, and that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day.'"[1] How could the sacrifice of the death of Christ be more amply estimated than by such terms—that the whole weight and benefit of the Christian profession was derived from it—that it was the entire foundation of the Gospel and of our salvation? And how naturally does the Apostle's language, as quoted to confirm these views, conspire with them! Certainly if we must look anywhere for a fuller declaration of the momentous doctrine we are contemplating, it must be Tertullian himself, who in another place, when dealing with the same heresy, exclaims against its advocate with a vehemence scarcely excusable, but still most apt for my present purpose,[2] "O most wicked of men, who" (by supposing Jesus a phantom) "excusest the murderers of God. For unless Christ really suffered, he did not suffer at their hands at all. *Spare the one single hope of the whole world.*" It is not necessary, I think, to produce further evidence (which, however, might most easily be done) from this Father. Let us, then, turn to another.

"The body" (of Jesus), says Hippolytus, "though dead as to its human nature, has in it a mighty virtue of life; for

[1] Sic nec passiones Christi ejus fidem merebuntur: nihil enim passus est qui non vere est passus. Vere autem pati phantasma non potuit. Eversum est igitur totum Dei opus. Totum Christiani nominis et pondus et fructus, mors Christi negatur, quam tam impresse Apostolus demandat, utique veram, summum eam fundamentum Evangelii constituens, et salutis nostræ, et prædicationis suæ. Tradidi enim, inquit, vobis in primis, quod Christus mortuus sit pro peccatis nostris, et quod sepultus sit, et quod resurrexerit tertiâ die.—Adversus Marcionem, III. c. viii.

[2] Scelestissime hominum, qui interemptores excusas Dei. Nihil enim ab eis passus est Christus, si nihil vere est passus. Parce unicæ spei totius orbis.—De Carne Christi, c. v.

that which does not proceed from dead bodies in general, proceeded from it, even blood and water, in order that we might know what power unto life the virtue possessed which was enshrined in that body, so that it did not seem like other dead bodies, but could pour forth for us *the causes of life.*"[1]

Proceed we next to Origen; and still we shall find the argument for this vital doctrine only gathering further strength. "Let a man once lose his soul," says he, "or damage it, and if he gain the whole world he cannot find a ransom for it. For the soul which is made in the image of God is more precious than all things. There is only one who hath been able to give a ransom for a soul already lost, even he who hath *purchased us by his own precious blood.*"[2] Again, "We maintain that he received a human body from a woman, that he might live in it; and which might be capable of a human death. Accordingly, we say, that besides other matters, he fought a great fight by means of his human body, tempted in all things like other men, but not like other men a sinner, but totally without sin; for it is clear to us that he did no sin, neither was guile found in his mouth; and that not knowing sin, *God delivered him up as pure for all that had sinned.*"[3] Again, Celsus objects that Jesus, after disgracefully hiding himself, was taken. To this Origen replies by showing that the surrender of Jesus was voluntary. "I contend that if by 'being taken' be understood that he suffered capture against his will, he was not taken, for at the fitting time he allowed himself to fall into the hands of men, as the Lamb of God, *in order that he might take away the sin of the world.*"[4] And again, shortly afterwards, "to the sequel of the argument," says he, "we have already made answer, by showing that Jesus was not taken as a fugitive, but that of his own accord *he gave himself for us all.*"[5] And again,

[1] Hippolytus, p. 281. In a fragment of one of his Homilies.

[2] Εἷς μόνος δεδύνηται δοῦναι ἀντάλλαγμα τῆς ἀπολλυμένης πρότερον ψυχῆς ἡμῶν, ὁ ὠνησάμενος ἡμᾶς τῷ ἑαυτοῦ τιμίῳ αἵματι.—Origen, Exhortatio ad Martyrium, § 12.

[3] Τραυῶς γὰρ ἡμῖν φαίνεται, ὅτι ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ ἐποίησεν, οὐδὲ εὑρέθη δόλος ἐν τῷ στόματι αὐτοῦ· καὶ μὴ γνόντα αὐτὸν ἁμαρτίαν, ὡς καθαρὸν παρέδωκεν ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἡμαρτηκότων ὁ Θεός.—Contra Celsum, I. § 69.

[4] Ἀλλ' ἐπεί φησι καὶ ὅτι ἑάλω· εἴποιμ' ἄν, ὅτι εἴπερ τὸ ἁλῶναι ἀκούσιόν ἐστι, οὐκ ἑάλω ὁ Ἰησοῦς· ἑαυτὸν γὰρ ἐν ἐπιτηδείῳ καιρῷ εἰς χεῖρας ἀνθρώπων γενέσθαι οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν, ὡς ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἵν' ἄρῃ τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου.—II. § 10.

[5] Ἀπελογησάμεθα περὶ τῶν ἑξῆς

in nearly the same terms, "The Son of the Mighty God suffered of his own free will for the salvation of mankind."[1] And in another place he adopts an opinion respecting the Messiah to come, which Celsus had assigned in the first instance to the Jews; "that the world had been so full of wickedness, as to make it necessary that one should be sent from God in order that the unrighteous might be punished, and that all things might be purged similarly to what happened formerly at the flood"[2]—a very strong declaration surely of the scale on which the Passion of Christ acted in expiating the sin of man. Again, Celsus having suggested that Jonah was more fit to be exalted to a Deity than Jesus, Origen observes that Celsus must have written this merely to fill his book, "preferring Jonah who preached repentance to the single city of Nineveh, to Jesus who preached repentance to the whole world, and who effected far more than Jonah: and wishing us to proclaim him a God who certainly lived three days and three nights marvellously and wonderfully in the belly of the fish; yet not thinking that he who undertook to *die for mankind*, and to whom God had borne witness by the prophets, was worthy of the honour next after the God of the universe, on account of the great things he had done in heaven and earth."[3] And once more, "Touching Jesus, therefore, so far as the things done in him are done by the Godhead in him, they are holy; but so far as he was man, being endowed above any other man with a consummate share of self-reason and self-wisdom, he endured, as a wise and perfect man, whatever it was necessary for one to endure, who was *doing everything for the whole human race*, or rather for all reasonable creatures. And there is nothing incongruous in his dying as a man, and in his death being set forth not only as an example of dying for religion, but also as a thing which effected the beginning and progress of the overthrow of evil and of the

καὶ ἐν τοῖς πρὸ τούτων, δεικνύντες, ὅτι οὐ φεύγων ἑάλω ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ἀλλ' ἑκὼν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν πάντων παρέδωκεν ἑαυτόν.—Origen, Contra Celsum, § 11.

[1] Πάσχει γε ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ μεγίστου Θεοῦ βουληθεὶς ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀνθρώπων σωτηρίας.—IV. § 73.

[2] Ἰουδαῖοι δὴ παρ' αὐτῷ λέγουσι, πληρωθέντα τὸν βίον πάσης κακίας δεῖσθαι τοῦ καταπεμπομένου ἀπὸ Θεοῦ· ἵν' οἱ μὲν ἄδικοι κολασθῶσι, τὰ δὲ πάντα καθαρθῇ, ἀνάλογον τῷ πρώτῳ συμβάντι κατακλυσμῷ.—§ 20.

[3] Τὸν δ' ἀναδεξάμενον ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων ἀποθανεῖν, οὐκ ἤθελε Κέλσος, μαρτυρούμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τῶν προφητῶν ἄξιον εἶναι τῆς δευτερευούσης μετὰ τὸν Θεὸν τῶν ὅλων, δι' ἃ ἐποίησεν ἐν οὐρανῷ καὶ ἐπὶ γῆς ἀνδραγαθήματα, τιμῆς.—VII. § 57.

devil, who had got posssesion of the whole world."[1] Let this suffice, though numberless other passages might be produced from Origen bearing upon the same subject, and to the same effect.

If we appeal to Cyprian, we still only receive further testimony to the primitive character of the doctrine of the Atonement. For instance, "Let us then," says he, "betake ourselves to prayer . . . . , after our Lord's example, who went out into a mountain to pray; and his prayer was for us, and not for himself . . . . ; but if he laboured and watched in prayer for us, how much rather ought we to do so for ourselves; first of all entreating the Lord himself, and then making *satisfaction to the Father through him.*"[2] Again, "Let it not be matter for our execration, that you have begun the glorious first-fruits of your confession, by being beaten with clubs. The body of the Christian does not shudder at the club; for *all the hope of the Christian lies in the tree.* The servant of Christ hails the symbol of his salvation. Redeemed by the tree to life eternal, by the tree is he advanced to his crown."[3] Cyprian's several books of "Testimonies against the Jews," are dictated from first to last in a thoroughly Anti-Socinian spirit. Thus chap. xvi. of the first book has for its title, "That the old sacrifice is done away, and the new sacrifice established;" chap. xxiv. "That the Jews can obtain pardon of their sins in this manner only, by washing away the blood of Christ, whom they slew, in Christian Baptism, and by passing over to the Church and obeying its precepts;" chap. vii. of the second book, "That Christ is God who was to come, the Illuminator and Saviour of the human race;" chap. xxi. "That in the Passion and sign of the Cross is all virtue and power;" chap. xxvii.

[1] Ὑπέμεινεν, ὡς σοφὸς καὶ τελειος, ἅπερ ἐχρῆν ὑπομεῖναι τὸν ὑπὲρ πάντος τοῦ γενοῦς τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἢ καὶ τῶν λογικῶν, πάντα πράττοντα. Καὶ οὐδὲν ἄτοπον, καὶ ἀποτεθνηκέναι τὸν ἄνθρωπον, καὶ τὸν θάνατον αὐτοῦ οὐ μόνον παράδειγμα ἐκκεῖσθαι τοῦ ὑπὲρ εὐσεβείας ἀποθνήσκειν, ἀλλὰ γὰρ καὶ εἰργάσθαι ἀρχὴν καὶ προκοπὴν τῆς καταλύσεως τοῦ πονηροῦ καὶ διαβόλου, πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν νενεμημένου.—Origen, Contra Celsum, VII. § 17.

[2] Quod si pro nobis ac pro delictis nostris ille et laborabat, et vigilabat, et precabatur, quanto nos magis insistere precibus et orare, et primo ipsum Dominum orare, tum deinde per ipsum Deo Patri satisfacere debemus?—Cyprian, Ep. vii. § 5.

[3] Quod autem fustibus cæsi prius graviter et afflicti, per ejusmodi pœnas initiastis confessionis vestræ gloriosa primordia, execranda nobis ista res non est. Neque enim ad fustes Christianum corpus expavit, cujus est spes omnis in ligno. Sacramentum salutis suæ Christi servus agnovit. Redemptus ligno ad vitam æternam ligno provectus est ad coronam.—Ep. lxxvii. § 2.

"That no one can come to God the Father, but through his Son Jesus Christ."

Now it certainly does appear to me that it is impossible to withstand such a cloud of witnesses as this; of whose evidence, however, be it remembered, I have only laid a small part under contribution. It seems most unreasonable, in the face of so clear an assertion of the Atonement, so universally made by the Christian writers of the first three centuries, to pretend that this doctrine does not really exist in Scripture after all; that the texts which are supposed to express it (and a vast number of such texts it must be admitted there are) are quite misunderstood when such a doctrine is deduced from them; and that all the Fathers who lived during the generations which immediately succeeded Christ and the Apostles, were under a mistake in imagining that they taught it. And accordingly, though we may not be always disposed to acquiesce in the interpretation which a particular Father imposes upon a particular passage of holy writ; yet when all of them, whether dwelling in Judæa, in Rome, in Asia Minor, in Gaul, in Alexandria, in Carthage, or elsewhere, concur in construing a large class of texts, which the Bible contains, as significant of the Atonement, without any misgiving at all; the Church, too, testifying to the same in her Councils, Creeds, and Liturgies, from the beginning—can we imagine that there is room for error? And can we contemplate the hardihood of those who reject a doctrine thus guaranteed, and take the consequences, without wonder and alarm? I, for one, am fully persuaded that numbers of Socinians have been made by the study of the early Fathers having passed into desuetude—speculation usurping the place of testimony—and, if I am right in this persuasion, need we inquire further into "the Use of the Fathers?"

§ 4.

On the Sacrament of Baptism.

ANOTHER leading feature in the Socinian school is the gross manner in which it depresses the nature and efficacy of the two Sacraments: and here, again, the Fathers are entirely opposed

to its teaching. "What think you concerning the baptism of water?" is a question in the Racovian Catechism. *A.* "That it is an external rite, whereby men, coming from Judaism or Gentilism to the Christian religion, did profess openly, that they acknowledge Christ for their Lord. *Q.* Do infants belong to that rite? *A.* By no means, for neither have we in the Scripture either precept or example thereof; nor can they, as the thing itself showeth, acknowledge Christ for their Lord. . . . *Q.* What think you of them that think they are regenerated by this rite? *A.* They are exceedingly mistaken, for regeneration is nothing but the transformation of our mind and will, and composure of them to the doctrine of our Saviour Christ, as the very word (regeneration) doth intimate. But such a transformation cannot have place in infants who know not good and evil, much less that a thing of so great moment should be incident to them. But that those of perfect age, in whom the transformation of mind and will hath place, should be regenerated by water, is so distant from truth, that it seemeth to carry a face of idolatry with it, whilst that is ascribed to a gross elemental thing, which is only to be ascribed to God himself and his Word," &c.[1]

Of original sin, which lies very much at the root of this question, I shall have a more convenient occasion to speak presently, when I come to consider the bearing of the Fathers on the subject of Calvinism; and when in showing that they did not hold the total corruption of our nature by the Fall, I shall necessarily show that they did hold, in a very ample manner, the doctrine of original sin, which the Socinian expressly denies. "There is no such thing as original sin," says this Catechism.[2] Taking credit, then, for being able to prove this point when the time arrives, I will in the meanwhile request my hearers to accompany me in the development of the sentiments of the Fathers on the Sacrament of Baptism; on the great dignity of the mystery, and on the persons to whom it is fitting to administer it.

Now there is scarcely a form in which the doctrine of regeneration in Baptism can be asserted, directly or indirectly, which we do not discover in the early Fathers. Thus Hermas, without using the term itself, fully appropriates the meaning

[1] Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. iv.

[2] c. x. Peccatum originis nullum prorsus est.

of it, as in other passages, so in the following, "Before a man receives the name of the Son of God, he is subject to death; but when he receives that seal, he is freed from *death*, and given over to *life*. But that seal is water; into which mankind descend, in bondage to *death*, but come out of the same made over to *life*."[1]

"Then they are led by us to the water," says Justin Martyr, "and are *regenerated* by the same process of *regeneration* by which we were ourselves *regenerated*: for they then receive the laver in the water, in the name of God the Father and Master of the universe, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and of the Holy Ghost. For Christ said, 'Unless ye be born again, ye cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven.'"[2]

"When our Lord gave to his disciples the power of *regeneration* to God," writes Irenæus, "he said to them, Go teach all nations *baptizing* them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."[3] Again, in commenting on the history of the blind man, whom Jesus restored to sight, Irenæus considers Jesus to have *created* the blind man's eyes out of the clay, that member having been left imperfect at his creation in the womb: and argues that as he was born defective in his frame through original mal-formation, and was born in sin through the original transgression, he had not only need of his generation being completed by the clay, but of his *regeneration* being effected by the *laver*; and therefore Jesus sent him to wash in the pool of Siloam, in virtue of which he was able to see and recognise his Saviour.[4] Again, having charged the heretics with inventing rites of initiation of their own, he says they had acted thus at the suggestion of Satan, "to the rejection of Baptism, which is *regeneration*

[1] Hermas, III. § 16.

[2] Ἔπειτα ἄγονται ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἔνθα ὕδωρ ἐστί, καὶ τρόπον ἀναγεννήσεως, ὃν καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτοὶ ἀνεγεννήθημεν, ἀναγεννῶνται· ἐπ' ὀνόματος γὰρ τοῦ Πατρὸς τῶν ὅλων καὶ δεσπότου Θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου τὸ ἐν τῷ ὕδατι τότε λουτρὸν ποιοῦνται. Καὶ γὰρ ὁ Χριστὸς εἶπεν· Ἂν μὴ ἀναγεννηθῆτε, οὐ μὴ εἰσελθητε εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν οὐρανῶν.—Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 61. See also § 66.

[3] Potestatem regenerationis in Deum dans discipulis dicebat eis: Euntes docete omnes gentes, baptizantes eos in nomine Patris et Filii et Spiritus sancti. —Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 1.

[4] Et quoniam in illâ plasmatione, quæ secundum Adam fuit, in transgressione factus homo indigebat lavacro regenerationis; postquam linivit lutum super oculos ejus, dixit ei: Vade in Siloam, et lavare; simul et plasmationem et eam, quæ est per lavacrum, regenerationem restituens ei. Et propter hoc lotus venit videns, ut et suum cognosceret plasmatorem, et disceret homo eum, qui donavit ei vitam.—V. c. xv. § 3.

to Godward;"[1] whilst the very ceremony which these heretics thus substituted for Baptism, and the effects they ascribed to it, reflect light, as is usual in such cases, on the Sacrament itself, as understood by the Fathers and the Church. For they affirmed that this initiation of theirs, or *ἀπολύτρωσις* "was necessary for those who had received perfect knowledge, in order that they might be *regenerated* unto that virtue or power which is above all; indeed, that without it, it would be impossible to enter the Pleroma, since it is that which conducts them to the depths of Bythus."[2] But it is not to any mechanical properties of water that Irenæus ascribes these spiritual results, as the Socinian Catechism would intimate was the Catholic prejudice; it would be strange if he did; but to the operation of the Holy Ghost, which, when connected with the washing of water by a mystical union, that derives all its virtue from God's appointment, regenerates. "Our bodies," says he, "receive that union which is to incorruption through the *laver;* our souls, through the Spirit; wherefore both are necessary, since both avail to the life which is of God;"[3] the meaning being this, that the body is invested with a capacity for rising again, and becoming immortal together with the soul, by means of the Spirit operating upon it through the soul, the confederate of the body, in the laver of Baptism.

Theophilus teaches the same doctrine of regeneration, though under a figure of his own, and it adds very greatly to the force of the evidence, by which it is shown that the doctrine itself was fully acknowledged and received in the Primitive Church, that it should be asserted under such a vast variety of forms. Thus Theophilus finds it in the very history of the creation: "God *blessed* the creatures," says he, "that were made out of the *waters*,[4] for a token that men would receive repentance and remission of sins by water and the bath of *regeneration;* even all those who come to the

[1] Εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος, τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως.—Irenæus, I. c. xxi. § 1.

[2] Λέγουσι δὲ αὐτὴν ἀναγκαίαν εἶναι τοῖς τὴν τελείαν γνῶσιν εἰληφόσιν, ἵνα εἰς τὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα δύναμιν ὦσιν ἀναγεγεννημένοι. Ἄλλως γὰρ ἀδύνατον ἐντὸς Πληρώματος εἰσελθεῖν· ἐπειδὴ αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ εἰς τὸ βάθος (τοῦ Βυθοῦ) κατάγουσα αὐτούς.—I. c. xxi. § 2.

[3] Corpora enim nostra per lavacrum illam, quæ est ad incorruptionem, unitatem acceperunt; animæ autem per Spiritum. Unde et utraque necessaria, quum utraque proficiunt in vitam Dei. —III. c. xvii. § 2.

[4] Gen. i. 21, 22.

truth and are *born again*, and experience a blessing from God;"[1] whereas the creatures made out of the earth he did not bless.[2] And here I may repeat an observation which I have already had occasion to make more than once, that an application of this kind of a text to the illustration of a doctrine, which it is difficult to believe had any relation to it whatever, argues very strongly how thoroughly established in the Church that doctrine was, since it even found its way into the earliest commentators on Scripture in a manner which nothing but its universal prevalence could account for. Probably the fact may have escaped the observation of many, that God is said to have blessed the creatures which the waters brought forth, and not to have blessed those which the earth did; but had it been noticed, the inference that the virtues of the Sacrament of Baptism were prophetically set forth in it, even before man himself, the subject of Baptism, was created, could never have presented itself to the mind of any one who had not assigned to Baptism a most prominent position in the Christian scheme.

Clemens Alexandrinus is equally clear in his testimony, and, like those who have gone before him, often gives it additional effect by the unstudied way in which he supplies, and the unlooked-for quarters from which he draws it. Thus, in describing the training to which Christ the Pædagogue submits the new convert, "He seems to me," says he, "to form man of the dust; to *regenerate him by water;* to make him grow by his Spirit; to instruct him by his word; directing him to adoption and salvation by his holy commandments; that transforming by his advent the earthly man into the heavenly, he might eminently fulfil that Divine expression, 'Let us make man in our image, after our likeness.'"[3] Again, when prescribing to females rules for the decoration of the person,

[1] "Ετι μὴν καὶ εὐλογήθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ὑδάτων γενόμενα, ὅπως ᾖ καὶ τοῦτο εἰς δεῖγμα τοῦ μέλλειν λαμβάνειν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους μετανοίαν καὶ ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν διὰ ὕδατος καὶ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας πάντας τοὺς προσίοντας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, καὶ ἀναγεννωμένους καὶ λαμβάνοντας εὐλογίαν παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ. — Theophilus, Ad Autol. II. § 16.

[2] Gen. i. 24.

[3] Καί μοι δοκεῖ αὐτὸς οὗτος πλάσαι μὲν τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐκ χοός· ἀναγεννῆσαι δὲ ὕδατι· αὐξῆσαι δὲ πνεύματι· παιδαγωγῆσαι δὲ ῥήματι, εἰς υἱοθεσίαν καὶ σωτηρίαν, ἁγίαις ἐντολαῖς κατευθύνων, ἵνα δὴ τὸν γηγενῆ εἰς ἅγιον καὶ ἐπουράνιον μεταπλάσας ἐκ προβάσεως ἄνθρωπον, ἐκείνην τὴν θεϊκὴν μάλιστα πληρώσῃ φωνήν· Ποιήσωμεν ἄνθρωπον κατ' εἰκόνα καὶ καθ' ὁμοίωσιν ἡμῶν. — Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. xii. p. 156.

and laying them under certain restrictions, Clemens betrays even here how completely the doctrine we are considering had possession of his mind. "Nor are these infatuated women," says he, "ashamed to set all their affections on this bauble of an oyster shell; whereas they have it in their power to adorn themselves with the holy stone, the Word of God, which Scripture somewhere calls a pearl, even the bright and pure Jesus, the eye in the flesh which is fixed on us, the transparent Word; by whom the flesh is made precious, *being regenerated in the water*: for that shell, engendered in the water, encloses the flesh, and from that flesh the pearl is conceived."[1] Again, still more emphatically, "'Call no man your father upon the earth,'[2] said the Lord; *i. e.* do not account him who sows you according to the fleshly seed, the author of your being, but rather the concurrent cause or minister of your birth. Accordingly he desires that we being converted, should again *become as children*, knowing him who is truly our Father; *regenerated by water*, which is a sowing after another sort than the common."[3] Moreover Clemens enters into many details with respect to this Sacrament, details analogous to those of the birth in the flesh; thus giving a peculiar propriety to the term *regeneration*, and rescuing it from being thought a mere figure of speech, which would bear no close interpretation; details which, I may add in passing, our own Church shows that she does not flinch from, by adopting the terms *Godfathers* and *Godmothers* to designate the parties who promote the spiritual generation of the infant, by taking for him the pledges, or engaging to remind him of them, or both. Thus, "this was the saying, 'Unless ye be converted, and become as little children,' *i. e.* pure in body and holy in soul, by abstaining from all evil

[1] Καὶ οὐκ αἰσχύνονται αἱ κακοδαίμονες, περὶ ὄστριον ὀλίγον τοῦτο τὴν πᾶσαν σπουδὴν πεποιημέναι· ἐξὸν ἁγίῳ κοσμεῖσθαι λίθῳ, τῷ Λόγῳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὃν Μαργαρίτην ἡ γραφὴ κέκληκέν που, τὸν διαυγῆ καὶ καθαρὸν Ἰησοῦν, τὸν ἐν σαρκὶ ἐπόπτην ὀφθαλμὸν, τὸν Λόγον τὸν διαφανῆ· δι' ὃν ἡ σὰρξ τιμία ὕδατι ἀναγεννωμένη· καὶ γὰρ τὸ ὄστριον ἐκεῖνο ἐν ὕδατι γιγνόμενον περιστέγει τὴν σάρκα· ἐκ δὲ ταύτης ὁ μαργαρίτης κυΐσκεται.—Paedag. II. c. xii. p. 241.

[2] Matt. xxiii. 9.

[3] Μὴ καλέσητε οὖν ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς πατέρα, φησίν· οἷον, μὴ αἴτιον ἡγήσησθε τὸν σπείραντα ὑμᾶς τὴν κατὰ σάρκα σποράν τῆς οὐσίας ὑμῶν, ἀλλὰ συναίτιον γενέσεως, μᾶλλον δὲ διάκονον γενέσεως· οὕτως οὖν ἐπιστραφέντας ἡμᾶς αὖθις ὡς τὰ παιδία γενέσθαι βούλεται, τὸν ὄντως Πατέρα ἐπιγνόντας, δι' ὕδατος ἀναγεννηθέντας, ἄλλης ταύτης οὔσης ἐν τῇ κτίσει σποράς.—Strom. III. c. xii. p. 551.

deeds; whereby he shows that he wishes us to be such as he *begat us out of the womb of the water*; for the one birth succeeding the other birth has for its object to advance us to immortality."[1] Moreover, on the natural birth of an infant, it was usual to give it *milk and honey*[2]; and accordingly in reference to the same food, says Clemens, "As soon as we are regenerated, we are nourished with the good tidings of the hope of rest, even of the Jerusalem that is above; where, Scripture tells us, it rains milk and honey."[3] And again, in a subsequent part of the same chapter, Clemens touches upon the same custom, and further enlarges on it in the mystical way which is usual with him; finding in the milk which mixes with water (the only liquid according to him which does so) a parallel to the word which has a like affinity to Baptism, as in the honey which has the property of a cathartic, a parallel to the effect of that Sacrament which purges away sin.[4] So that all the incidents of a birth are described as attaching to Baptism, as though the resemblance of the spiritual and the natural process was substantial. How entirely opposed is all this to the character of a theology which finds in Baptism nothing but an external rite, that announces a new convert; representing as it does so manifestly the Holy Ghost as the active mover in it, and the cleansing from all sin as the blessed effect of it. Regeneration being thus connected with Baptism, it follows that the regenerated are those who are rightly baptized; or, in other words, are the body of Christians. "We call those who are *regenerated by the same* Word, *brethren*."[5]

Tertullian furnishes still further information on this Sacra-

[1] Τοῦτο γὰρ ἦν τὸ εἰρημένον, Ἐὰν μὴ στραφέντες γένησθε ὡς τὰ παιδία· καθαροὶ μὲν τὴν σάρκα, ἅγιοι δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν, κατὰ ἀποχὴν κακῶν ἔργων, δεικνύντες ὅτι τοιούτους ἡμᾶς εἶναι βούλεται, οἵους καὶ γεγέννηκεν ἐκ μήτρας ὕδατος· γένεσις γὰρ γένεσιν διαδεχομένη κατὰ προκοπὴν ἀπαθανατίζειν βούλεται.—Stromat. IV. § xxv. pp. 636, 637.

[2] Barnabas, § 6.

[3] Εὐθὺς δὲ ἀναγεννηθέντες τετιμήμεθα (l. τιθηνούμεθα, repeating this word from the sentence immediately preceding) τῆς ἀναπαύσεως τὴν ἐλπίδα, τὴν ἄνω Ἱερουσαλὴμ εὐαγγελιζόμενοι· ἐν ᾗ μέλι καὶ γάλα ὀμβρεῖν ἀναγέγραπται.—Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 124. Compare also p. 128, note 3.

[4] Καὶ ἦν ὁ Λόγος ἔχει πρὸς τὸ βάπτισμα κοινωνίαν, ταύτην ἔχει τὸ γάλα τὴν συναλλαγὴν πρὸς τὸ ὕδωρ· δέχεται γὰρ μόνον τῶν ὑγρῶν τοῦτο καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὸ ὕδωρ μίξιν, ἐπικάθαρσιν παραλαμβανόμενον· καθάπερ τὸ βάπτισμα ἐπὶ ἀφέσει ἁμαρτιῶν. Μίγνυνται δὲ καὶ μέλιτι προσφυῶς, καὶ τοῦτο ἐπὶ καθαρσει πάλιν μετὰ γλυκείας τῆς τροφῆς.—Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 128.

[5] Ἧι καὶ ἀδελφοὺς τοὺς τῷ αὐτῷ Λόγῳ ἀναγεννηθέντας προσαγορεύομεν. —Stromat. II. § ix. p. 450.

ment; and so far is he from depressing it, that references to it abound throughout his works, to say nothing of the treatise which he expressly writes on it. He, too, finds in it the new birth. "Blessed are ye whom the grace of God awaits, as ye come up out of that most *sacred laver of the new birth*, and stretch out your firstling hands to your mother Church with your brethren."[1] Again, "When the soul attains unto the faith, fashioned anew by a second nativity of water and the virtue from above, the veil of former corruption is drawn aside, and it beholds the perfect light. And in this birth it is received by the Holy Spirit, as in the former birth it was received by the spirit of evil."[2] There is a remarkable passage in the treatise against Marcion, which brings together the several aspects in which Baptism was contemplated by the early Church; and it is impossible to conceive anything more adverse than it is to the Socinian views of this Sacrament throughout. Tertullian is objecting to Marcion the various obstacles which opposed themselves to the theory of two Gods —the one God, the original Creator, of a mixed character— the other not known till Christ revealed him, a God of pure goodness or mercy. "There can be no sacrament of faith," says he, "in this latter; for to what purpose is Baptism unto him enjoined? If it is *the remission of sins*, how shall he be thought to remit sins, who is not thought to retain them, for he would retain them, if he judged them. If it is *absolution from death*, how should he loose from death, who hath never bound unto death? For he would have bound, if he had condemned from the beginning. If it is *the regeneration of man*, how does he regenerate, who hath never generated? For the repetition of an act cannot be predicated of him who hath never done the act at all. If it is *the procurement of the Holy Spirit*, how will he add the Spirit who did not in the first instance contribute the soul? For the soul is, as it were, the substratum of the Spirit."[3] We have here, no

[1] Igitur benedicti quos gratia Dei expectat, cum de illo sanctissimo lavacro novi natalis ascenditis, et primas manus apud Matrem cum fratribus aperitis.—Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. xx.

[2] Proinde cum ad fidem pervenit reformata per secundam nativitatem ex aquâ et supernâ virtute, detracto corruptionis pristinæ aulæo totam lucem suam conspicit. Excipitur etiam a Spiritu sancto, sicut in pristinâ nativitate a spiritu profano.—De Animâ, c. xli.

[3] Jam nec ipsum fidei ejus sacramentum. Cui enim rei baptisma quoque apud eum exigitur? Si remissio delictorum est, quomodo videbitur de-

doubt, all the aspects in which Baptism was regarded; and what is remarkable, and gives great force to the passage, is this, that it is not intended by Tertullian to be exponential of Baptism; but all these acknowledged features of Baptism are touched on, and severally laid under contribution for the purpose of refuting a theory of Marcion's, which had no direct reference to Baptism. I certainly cannot see how Socinian notions of this Sacrament could have possibly established themselves, had the study of the Fathers been habitually pursued, and that weight been attached to their testimony on such a subject, which can hardly be denied to persons who lived so very soon after Jesus had uttered the command, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." And I do think that they take upon themselves a deep responsibility who discourage the reading of these authors; and that at their door may be laid much of the Socinian heresy, which, under a modified form, has affected, and still does affect, the opinions of Churchmen, even of those who in the abstract would be shocked at the idea of being partakers with that sect. In further pursuance of this idea of regeneration in Baptism, or of the life engendered in that Sacrament out of the state of death which preceded it, might be quoted such other passages from Tertullian as the following. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life,"[1] on which observes Tertullian, "This element was in the first instance commanded to bring forth whatever had life, in order that it might not seem strange if water in *Baptism* should be found to *give life.*"[2] "Blessed Sacrament," he again exclaims, in the same treatise, "of this water of ours, by which being washed from the offences of pristine blindness, we are *liberated unto life eternal.*"[3] And again, when extolling the

licta dimittere, qui non videbitur retinere? quia retineret, si judicaret. Si absolutio mortis est, quomodo absolveret a morte, qui non devinxit ad mortem? devinxisset enim, si a primordio damnasset. Si regeneratio est hominis, quomodo regenerat qui non generavit? Iteratio enim non competit ei a quo quid nec semel factum est. Si consecutio est Spiritus sancti, quomodo Spiritum attribuet, qui animam non prius contulit? quia suffectura est quodammodo Spiritus anima.—Adversus Marcionem, I. c. xxviii.

[1] Gen. i. 24.

[2] Primis aquis præceptum est animas proferre. Primus liquor quod viveret edidit, ne mirum sit in Baptismo, si aquæ animare noverunt.—De Baptismo, c. iii.

[3] Felix sacramentum aquæ nostræ quâ

merits of martyrdom, which he regards as a Baptism of blood, he concludes, "For it is peculiar to the martyr, that nothing can be imputed to him, seeing that he *puts off life in the very laver*," [1] which implies that so life-giving is Baptism, that he who dies on the act, no subsequent interval ensuing during which its virtues might be neutralized by sin, would at once find himself in a blessed immortality. Nay, more, in reply to an objection conceived very much in the spirit of the clause of the Racovian Catechism prefixed to these remarks on Baptism, the objection that it is a thing incredible for eternal life to be obtained by our being let down into the water, dipped whilst a few words are said, and raised out of it again, apparently little or not at all more clean, Tertullian asserts that nothing so much hardens men's hearts as the simplicity which appears in the act of God's operations, and the magnificence, under his guarantee, of the effect. "Miserable unbelief," he then exclaims, "which denies to God his own attributes, simplicity and power. Why, no doubt, it is a wonder that *death should be washed away by the laver!*" [2] Not that he would ascribe such vast results to "a gross elemental thing like water," as the Catechism expresses it, but that the Holy Spirit, having moved on the water at the first, in anticipation of its future field of action—all water receiving from this its original prerogative, the mystery of sanctification, when God has been invoked on it—descending from heaven rests on it and sanctifies it, and being thus sanctified, it at the same time imbibes the power of imparting sanctification.[3] Wherefore, in further token that Tertullian assigns the efficacy, not to the element but to the Sacrament, he designates the water which the heathens used

abluti delictis pristinæ cæcitatis, in vitam æternam liberamur.—De Baptismo, c. i.

[1] Proprie enim martyribus nihil jam reputari potest, quibus in lavacro ipsa (l. ipso) vita deponitur.—Scorpiace, c. vi.

[2] Nihil adeo est quod tam obduret mentes hominum, quam simplicitas divinorum operum quæ in actu videtur, et magnificentia quæ in effectu repromittitur: ut hic quoque, quoniam tantâ simplicitate sine pompâ, sine apparatu novo aliquo, denique sine sumptu homo in aquâ demissus, et inter pauca verba tinctus, non multo vel nihilo mundior resurgit, eo incredibilis existimetur consecutio æternitatis . . . Pro! misera incredulitas, quæ denegas Deo proprietates suas, simplicitatem et potestatem. Quid ergo? nonne mirandum et lavacro dilui mortem?—De Baptismo, c. ii.

[3] Sed ea satis erit præcerpsisse, in quibus et ratio Baptismi recognoscitur prima illa, quæ jam tunc etiam ipso habitu prænotabatur ad Baptismi figuram, Dei Spiritum, qui ab initio supervectabatur, super aquas intinctorum moraturum.—c. iv.

in their rites of initiation, "aquæ viduæ."[1] He would have expressed himself (as would other of the Fathers when speaking on the same subject) more correctly, had he represented the Holy Ghost as descending on the *recipients* in their use of the Sacrament, rather than on the element. It is probable, however, and so Dr. Waterland thinks,[2] that they were all right in the main thing, "It being all one with them to say, in a confused general way, either that the Holy Ghost sanctified the receivers in the use of the outward symbols, or that he sanctified the symbols to their use;" and our own Church seems to recognise the other way of expressing the meaning, when she says, "Sanctify this water to the mystical washing away of sin."

Origen ascribes the same importance to Baptism, and speaks of it in the same terms. "Let us bear in mind," says he, in his "Exhortatio ad Martyrium," "of what sins we have been guilty, and that *we cannot receive remission of sins without Baptism*; and that it is not possible, according to the laws of the Gospel, to be a second time baptized for the remission of sins, with water and the Spirit; and that to us is given the Baptism of martyrdom,"[3] the argument being that martyrdom would replace the baptized party who had contracted sins since his Baptism in the same position which Baptism had left him in, namely, absolved from sin. Again, in the "De Principiis," when speaking of several ways in which the Spirit is given, he sets Baptism in the foremost place.[4] And again, the necessity of Baptism being administered in the name of the undivided Trinity is thus expressed in the same treatise, "It seems right to inquire what is the reason why he who is *regenerated by God unto salvation* had need of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, and will not receive salvation unless this undivided Trinity be there; and why it is not possible that he should be partaker of the Father and of

[1] De Baptismo, c. v.

[2] Waterland, Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, ch. v. Works, vol. vii. p. 94, Oxf. Ed.

[3] Ὑπομνησθῶμεν δὲ καὶ ὧν ἡμαρτήκαμεν· καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων χωρὶς βαπτίσματος λαβεῖν· καὶ ὅτι οὐκ ἔστι δυνατὸν κατὰ τοὺς εὐαγγελικοὺς νόμους αὖθις βαπτίσασθαι ὕδατι καὶ Πνεύματι εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτημάτων· καὶ ὅτι βάπτισμα ἡμῖν δίδοται τὸ τοῦ μαρτυρίου. — Origen, Exhortatio ad Martyrium, § 30.

[4] Qui spiritus siquidem divinæ naturæ, id est Spiritus sanctus intelligendus est, sentiemus hoc dictum de dono Spiritus sancti: quod, sive per Baptismum, etc.—De Principiis, II. c. x. § 7.

the Son, without the Holy Ghost."[1] And once more, in the comment on the Song of Solomon, "The season for pruning is come by faith in my passion and resurrection, for sins are pruned and cut away from men, when remission of sins is given in Baptism;" or, as the Greek has it (for the Greek of the last clause has been preserved), "the season of pruning and putting away sins is by the laver of regeneration,"[2] which is even more to my purpose than the Latin of Rufinus, whose translation, therefore, in the previous quotation from the "De Principiis" is the less liable to suspicion, inasmuch as the purport of it is confirmed by this fragment still existing in the original language.

Hippolytus happens to be more than usually explicit in the declaration of his sentiments on this question—the manifestation of the Godhead of Jesus at his Baptism, which is the subject of one of his dissertations, leading him to speak of it at some length. "The Father of Immortality," says he, "sent his Immortal Son and Word into the world, who, coming amongst men to *wash them with water and the Spirit*, and *begetting them again to immortality* of soul and body, breathed into us the breath of life, clothing us with an immortal panoply. If, therefore, man is made immortal, he will be God.[3] If he is made God through water and the Holy Ghost after *regeneration of the laver*, he is found to be fellow-heir with Christ after his resurrection from the dead. Wherefore I make proclamation and say, Come all ye families of the earth to the immortality of Baptism. I bring good tidings of life to you who dwell in the darkness of ignorance. Come out of slavery to freedom; out of tyranny to a kingdom; out of corruption to incorruption. And how shall we come? it is said. *By water and the Holy Spirit.* This is the water in communion with the Spirit by which Paradise is watered, the earth enriched, the plants are nourished, animals are generated, and in a word *man is born again and quickened*, in which

[1] Rectum tamen videtur inquirere quid causæ sit, quod qui regeneratur per Deum in salutem, opus habet et Patre et Filio et Spiritu sancto, non percepturus salutem nisi sit integra Trinitas · nec possibile sit participem fieri Patris vel Filii sine Spiritu sancto.—Origen, De Principiis, I. c. iii. § 5.

[2] Sed et putationis tempus per fidem meæ passionis et resurrectionis advenit. Amputantur enim et exsecantur ab hominibus peccata, cum in Baptismo donatur remissio peccatorum. But in the Greek we have, καιρὸς δὲ πάλιν καὶ τῆς τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων ἐκκοπῆς καὶ ἀφέσεως διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας. —In Cantic. Canticor. vol. iii. p. 68.

[3] 2 Pet. i. 4.

Christ was baptized, on which the Spirit descended in the form of a dove."[1] Again, the old prophets declared, through the Spirit, things to come. "Accordingly they proclaimed the advent of God in the flesh; his advent by means of a birth, growth, conversation among men, and life, from the undefiled and God-bearing Mary; and his demonstration by Baptism, that there was to be a new birth for all men, through *the laver of regeneration.*"[2]

Cyprian furnishes such a profusion of evidence for the dignity of the Sacrament of Baptism, to the same effect as I have already adduced from Fathers before him, that it is impossible to collect all or half of it within the limits I prescribe myself. "Baptism is a second and spiritual birth whereby we are born in Christ by the laver of regeneration . . . The water alone cannot wash away sins and sanctify the man, unless it has the Holy Spirit . . . . That is Baptism, according to the Apostle, wherein *the old man dies*, and *the new man is born*, for he says, By the *washing of regeneration* he saved us."[3] Again, "All, indeed, who come to the

[1] Ὁ τῆς ἀθανασίας Πατὴρ τὸν ἀθάνατον Υἱὸν καὶ Λόγον ἀπέστειλεν εἰς τὸν κόσμον. Ὃς ἀφικόμενος εἰς τὸν ἄνθρωπον, λούσασθαι ὕδατι καὶ Πνεύματι καὶ ἀναγεννήσας πρὸς ἀφθαρσίαν ψυχῆς τε καὶ σώματος, ἐνεφύσησεν ἡμῖν πνεῦμα ζωῆς, περιαμφιάσας ἡμᾶς ἀφθάρτῳ πανοπλίᾳ. Εἰ οὖν ἀθάνατος γέγονεν ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ἔσται καὶ Θεός. Εἰ δὲ Θεὸς δι' ὕδατος καὶ Πνεύματος ἁγίου μετὰ τὴν τῆς κολυμβήθρας ἀναγέννησιν γίνεται, εὑρίσκεται καὶ συγκληρονόμος Χριστοῦ μετὰ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν. Διὸ κηρύσσω λέγων, δεῦτε πᾶσαι αἱ πατριαὶ τῶν ἐθνῶν ἐπὶ τὴν τοῦ βαπτίσματος ἀθανασίαν. Ζωὴν ὑμῖν εὐαγγελίζομαι, τοῖς ἐν τῷ ζόφῳ τῆς ἀγνωσίας ἐνδιατρίβουσιν. Δεῦτε εἰς ἐλευθερίαν ἐκ δουλείας, εἰς βασιλείαν ἐκ τυραννίδος, εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐκ τῆς φθορᾶς. Καὶ πῶς, φησιν, ἐλευσόμεθα; πῶς; δι' ὕδατος καὶ ἁγίου Πνεύματος. Τοῦτο δέ ἐστιν τὸ ὕδωρ τὸ Πνεύματι κοινωνοῦν δι' οὗ παράδεισος ποτίζεται, δι' οὗ ἡ γῆ πιαίνεται, δι' οὗ φυτὸν αὔξει, δι' οὗ ζῶα τεκνογονεῖ, καὶ ἵνα πάντα συνελὼν εἴπω, δι' οὗ ἀναγεννώμενος ζωογονεῖται ἄνθρωπος, ἐν ᾧ καὶ ὁ Χριστὸς ἐβαπτίσατο, ἐν ᾧ καὶ τὸ Πνεῦμα κατήρχετο ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς.—Hippolytus, Homilia in Theophania, § viii.

[2] Διὸ δὴ καὶ τὴν τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ σαρκὸς ἐπιδημίαν τῷ κόσμῳ κηρύξαντες, τὴν ἐκ τῆς παναχράντου καὶ θεοτόκου Μαρίας, γεννήσεώς τε καὶ αὐξήσεως, καὶ τῆς μετὰ ἀνθρώπων ἀναστροφῆς καὶ βιώσεως, καὶ τὴν διὰ βαπτίσματος ἀνάδειξιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις γενησομένην ἀναγέννησιν, διὰ λουτροῦ παλιγγενεσίας.—De Consummatione Mundi et Antichristo, § i.

Jewel accounts this treatise clearly spurious (the view of Antichrist, perhaps, not serving the ultra-reformers). Bishop Bull, on the other hand, accounts it genuine, and replies to the arguments of its impugners. Def. Fid. Nic. Sect. 3. c. viii. § 4. There are some expressions in it, certainly, with which later times became much more familiar, as *θεοτόκος*, § i. and *μοναχοί*, § vii. That the former expression, however, was in use long before the Nestorian controversy is certain.

[3] Nativitas secunda spiritalis sit, quâ in Christo per lavacrum regenerationis nascimur . . . . Peccata purgare et hominem sanctificare aqua sola non potest,

Divine laver, in the sanctification of Baptism, put off there the old man by the grace of that laver unto life; and being renewed by the Holy Spirit are purged from the defilement of original sin by this *second birth*. But the sanctity and truth of this second birth appertains still more to you, in whom the lusts of the flesh and of the body are now no more."[1] And again, in the same treatise, he speaks of "Our members, which are the temple of God, being purged from all filth of original sin by the sanctification of the *vital laver*."[2] Once more, "Whilst I was lying in darkness and blind night, and floating on the unstable sea of this world, ignorant of my life, and a stranger to truth and light, I thought (such at that time were my habits) that the merciful promise of God touching my salvation would be altogether hard to be accomplished, namely, that one should be born again: that quickened unto new life by the laver of the bath of salvation, one might put off what one was before, and whilst the frame of the body remained the same, the man might be changed in spirit and in mind. How is so great a change possible, said I,"[3] &c., with much more to the same purpose equally strong. "By the generation of Baptism we are made *children of God*," "an *elect people of God*."[4] Baptism is the beginning and "origin of all faith, the salutary entrance to the hope of life eternal."[5]

Such is the character which the early Fathers assign to the

nisi habeat et Spiritum sanctum.—Cyprian, Ep. lxxiv. § 5.—Baptisma enim esse in quo homo vetus moritur et novus nascitur manifestat et probat beatus Apostolus dicens: "Servavit nos per lavacrum regenerationis."—§ 6.

[1] Omnes quidem qui ad divinum lavacrum Baptismi sanctificatione perveniunt, hominem illic veterem gratiâ lavacri salutaris exponunt, et innovati Spiritu sancto, a sordibus contagionis antiquæ iteratâ nativitate purgantur. Sed nativitatis iteratæ vobis major sanctitas et veritas competit, quibus desideria jam carnis et corporis nulla sunt.—De Habitu Virginum, § xxiii.

[2] Scientes quod templa Dei sint membra nostra, ab omni fœce contagionis antiquæ lavacri vitalis sanctificatione purgata.—§ ii.

[3] Ego cum in tenebris atque in nocte cæcâ jacerem, cumque in salo jactantis sæculi nutabundus ac dubius vestigiis oberrantibus fluctuarem, vitæ meæ nescius, veritatis ac lucis alienus, difficile prorsus ac durum pro illis tunc moribus opinabar quod in salutem mihi divina indulgentia pollicebatur, ut quis renasci denuo posset, utque, in novam vitam lavacro aquæ salutaris animatus, quod prius fuerat exponeret, et corporis licet manente compage hominem animo ac mente mutaret. Qui possibilis, aiebam, est tanta conversio, etc.—Cyprian, Ep. i. § 3.

[4] Prænuntiavit illic per prophetam Deus quod apud gentes in locis quæ inaquosa prius fuissent, flumina postmodum redundarent et electum genus Dei, id est per generationem Baptismi filios Dei factos, adaquarent.—Ep. lxiii. § 8.

[5] Cum inde incipiat omnis fidei origo, et ad spem vitæ æternæ salutaris ingressio.—Ep. lxxiii. § 12.

Sacrament of Baptism; such are the effects, which according to them flow from it, when nothing interferes to abate its natural force: and this is evident, because whilst they designate it and describe its office in the emphatic terms we have seen they do, they still contemplate it in relation to infants amongst others. In them, therefore, it must operate of its own intrinsic virtue: they are passive recipients of the rite; as they were of the evil nature which renders the administration of it in their case necessary. You will remember that Justin Martyr speaks of persons of 60 and 70 years of age, of his own time, who had been disciples of Christ *from their childhood* [1]; that Irenæus tells of the Saviour having "come to save all men by himself, all, that is, who by him are *born again* to God, *infants*, children, boys, youths, and elder men:" [2] that Clemens Alexandrinus talks of "the children that are drawn up out of the water" [3] in a passage certainly alluding to Baptism: that Cyprian is quite express on the duty of baptizing infants, having written a letter [4] on the very subject; indeed, the question to which the letter is a reply is not, whether Baptism ought to be administered to infants, but whether it ought to be administered before the eighth day after the birth, and this he decides in the affirmative: that an Apostolical Constitution runs thus, "Baptize too even your infants, and bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, for he saith, Suffer the children to come unto me." [5]

In order, however, to protect the Fathers from misconstruction, and from the imputation often alleged against them by those who know little of their spirit, that the mere *opus operatum* was all they looked to in Baptism; and that such formalists were they, that in all cases they rested the efficacy of the Sacrament in the mere act and administration; I would remind you of the solemn obligations they considered it to lay the parties under, when they were of an age capable of understanding them; and even of the excessive stringency with which in one particular they drew those obligations tight. These obligations were in abeyance only during child-

[1] Οἱ ἐκ παίδων ἐμαθητεύθησαν τῷ Χριστῷ.—Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 15.

[2] Irenæus, II. c. xxii. § 4.

[3] Clem. Alex. Pædag. III. c. xi. p. 289.

[4] Ep. lix.

[5] Βαπτίζετε δὲ ὑμῶν καὶ τὰ νήπια, καὶ ἐκτρέφετε αὐτὰ ἐν παιδείᾳ καὶ νουθεσίᾳ Θεοῦ. Ἄφετε γὰρ, φησὶ, τὰ παιδία ἔρχεσθαι πρός με.—Constitut. Apost. VI. c. xv.

hood. The sponsors of the child (for sponsors he had),[1] devolved them all upon him, when his years and understanding allowed him to be aware of his debt; the child then succeeding to the position of one, who was baptized in his maturer age. Now only bear in mind the precautions by which the Church—as the Fathers represent it, themselves concurring in the propriety of such measures—protected the approach of adults to Baptism: the anxiety she evinced according to them, to impress them with the idea of the weight of personal obligation they were about to incur by participation in that Sacrament. I had occasion to investigate the particulars of the process in a previous Lecture[2]; and I shall content myself, therefore, with simply reminding you, that they had to go through repeated stages of probation, first as "auditores," then as "catechumeni;" the whole period occupying several years: that during this novitiate, confessions and promises were exacted of them, to be again repeated when they were to be actually baptized; and considered to form so integral a part of Baptism that the Sacrament itself is sometimes called *ὁμολογία*[3]—confessions of faith, promises of obedience to Christ's laws: that these confessions and promises were to be binding on them for life; Baptism, so far from having done its office when the rite was completed, having but then begun it. It was the habit of the Christians to keep themselves true to their profession, by calling to each other's recollection from time to time the pledges they had given for their good behaviour on this momentous occasion, as well as at the other of the Eucharist. "We are ever after reminding each other of these things,"[4] is the emphatic language of Justin Martyr, when he had described the particulars of the administration of Baptism and of the Eucharist in detail. And Tertullian puts the case very vividly by representing baptized persons as *fishes*, the enigmatical name of Christ (*ἰχθὺς*) impressed on Christians, "fishes born in the water, which are only safe whilst they *continue* in the water."[5] And Clemens extends

[1] Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. xviii.
[2] Lecture III. Second Series.
[3] Clem. Alex. Stromat, V. § xi. p. 689.
[4] *Ἡμεῖς δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα λοιπὸν ἀεὶ τούτων ἀλλήλους ἀναμιμνήσκομεν.* — Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 67.
[5] Sed nos pisciculi secundum *ἰχθὺν* nostrum Jesum Christum in aquâ nascimur, nec aliter quam in aquâ permanendo salvi sumus. — Tertullian, De Baptismo, c. i.

the figure and is not satisfied even with their being in the sea, unless they imbibe and appropriate its "salt;" alleging that in this respect the salt-water fish are faulty, because though living in brine from their birth, when cooked they have no savour in themselves.[1] Tertullian considers that by forfeiting the confessions and promises made at Baptism, we forfeit Baptism.[2] And nothing is more common in the practical treatises of the Fathers, than to find appeals to Christians to act up to their Baptismal vows. It is quite in the spirit of these early authors that our own Church acts, when in the Service for the Visitation of the Sick she urges the sufferer, not merely in general terms, to call up his self-accusing thoughts, but to do this "by remembering the profession which he made to God at his Baptism," and the more to encourage him to do this, she continues, "Therefore I shall rehearse unto you the articles of your faith," &c. Thus Tertullian, when pressing upon Christians the duty of habitually abstaining from the heathen spectacles, has at once recourse to this argument. "I will advert," says he, "to the obligations our *seal* imposes. When we enter the water, we profess our *belief* in the words of the Christian law; and we witness with our mouths that we have *renounced* the devil, his pomps, and his angels . . . . Now if it is apparent that the whole apparatus of the spectacles consists of idolatry, undoubtedly it must be already determined that the testimony of our *renunciation* in the laver appertains to these spectacles."[3] Again, when addressing the martyrs, "We were enlisted" (so he reminds them), "in the service of the living God, when we made our *responses* at the Sacrament."[4] Again, when denouncing various forms of idolatry in which Christians were

[1] Εἰσὶ γάρ τινες τῶν καὶ τοῦ λόγου ἐπακηκοότων τοῖς ἰχθύσι τοῖς θαλασσίοις ἐοικότες, οἳ δὴ ἐν ἅλμῃ ἐκ γενετῆς τρεφόμενοι, ἁλῶν ὅμως πρὸς τὴν σκευασίαν δέονται.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § viii. p. 340.

[2] Cæterum nonne ejeramus et rescindimus signaculum, rescindendo testationem ejus?—Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. xxiv.

[3] Ad principalem auctoritatem convertar ipsius signaculi nostri. Cum aquam ingressi Christianam fidem in legis suæ verba profitemur, renuntiasse nos diabolo et pompæ et angelis ejus ore nostro contestamur . . . . Igitur si ex idololatriâ universam spectaculorum paraturam constare constiterit, indubitate præjudicatum erit etiam ad spectacula pertinere renuntiationis nostræ testimonium in lavacro.—Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. iv.

[4] Vocati sumus ad militiam Dei vivi jam tunc, cum in sacramenti verba respondimus.—Ad Martyres, c. iii.

apt to get indirectly implicated—as for instance in the manufacture of idols, as carvers or sculptors—he once more presses the same consideration; and contends that they who fashion these images which are for the devil's service cannot be said to have *renounced* the devil[1]; the habitual influence which Baptism must have upon the life in order to be availing, forming quite a feature of patristic teaching, which speaks far more objectively than modern schools of theology have been disposed to do, and thereby produces a practical impression on the mind, which general exhortation without any such definite reference cannot do. But there is another consideration which proves in a still more undeniable manner how far the Fathers were from regarding Baptism as a mere *opus operatum*—a consideration which shows that their bias was quite in another direction; and, as I said, that they were disposed to regard its obligations as peremptory to a very alarming degree. For it was a notion entertained by several of them, that not more than one heinous sin (if even one) after Baptism could obtain pardon; a notion, which they seem to have formed on Hebrews x. 26, 27,[2] or on the other still more frequently quoted text to the same effect, Hebrews vi. 4, 5, 6[3]; so rigorous a fulfilment of the vows of Baptism during the whole subsequent life did they exact. And though some may be disposed to mitigate the harshness of this decree by supposing that they spoke of one public act of absolution by the Church when they spoke of one pardon; and that they were only declaring the impossibility of the Church encouraging a system of sinning and repenting, by frequent condonations, to the hardening of men's hearts—a view of the subject, which the language of Tertullian[4] very strongly confirms, as well as

[1] Quomodo enim renuntiavimus diabolo et angelis ejus, si eos facimus?—De Idololatriâ, c. vi.

[2] "For if we sin wilfully after that we have received the knowledge of the truth, there remaineth no more sacrifice for sins, but a certain fearful looking for of judgment, and fiery indignation which shall devour the adversaries."—See Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xiii. p. 459.

[3] "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened, and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the Holy Ghost, and have tasted the good Word of God, and the powers of the world to come, if they shall fall away, to renew them again unto repentance."

[4] Hujus igitur pœnitentiæ secundæ et unius, quanto in arcto negotium est, tanto operosior probatio, ut non solâ conscientiâ proferatur, sed aliquo etiam actu administretur. Is actus, qui magis Græco vocabulo exprimitur et frequentatur, exomologesis est, quâ delictum Domino nostrum confitemur; non quidem ut ignaro, sed quatenus satisfactio

that of Socrates,[1] quoted by Bishop Bull—still in any case the Fathers are proved to have contemplated Baptism in its *future obligations* with the utmost severity; to have been as far as possible from confining their notion of it to its positive and present grace; and to have been utterly indisposed to relax moral duties, by elevating the dignity of the Sacrament.

confessione disponitur, confessione pœnitentia nascitur, pœnitentiâ Deus mitigatur. Itaque exomologesis prosternendi et humilificandi hominis disciplina est . . . . sacco et cineri incubare . . . . presbyteris advolvi et caris Dei adgeniculari, omnibus fratribus legationes deprecationis suæ injungere.—Tertullian, De Pœnitentiâ, c. ix.

[1] Ὡς ἄρα οὐ χρὴ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ βάπτισμα ἡμαρτηκότας ἁμαρτίαν, ἣν πρὸς θάνατον καλοῦσιν αἱ θεῖαι γραφαὶ, τῆς κοινωνίας τῶν θείων μυστηρίων ἀξιοῦσθαι· ἀλλ' ἐπὶ μετανοίαν μὲν αὐτοὺς προτρέπειν· ἐλπίδα δὲ τῆς ἀφέσεως μὴ παρὰ τῶν ἱερέων, ἀλλὰ παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐκδέχεσθαι, τοῦ δυναμένου καὶ ἐξουσίαν ἔχοντος συγχωρεῖν ἁμαρτήματα.—Socrates, Eccles. Hist. I. c. 10.

This is represented in Socrates as a tenet of the Novatiani, asserted by Acesius, one of their Bishops.—See Bull, Def. Fid. Nic. Sec. 1, c. ii. § 4.

LECTURE XII.

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Socinian scheme. 5°. On the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Statement of the Racovian Catechism. Sentiments of the Fathers. The Eucharist contemplated by them, first as a *sacrifice*, not material (except as including an oblation of the fruits of the earth), but commemorative of the sacrifice of Christ; and secondly, as the *spiritual* food of his Body and Blood. Their testimony unfavourable to the Romish as well as to the Socinian views. The benefit not ascribed to the *opus operatum*, but represented as dependent on the fitness of the recipient. Strictness in this particular.

§ 5.

On the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

THE Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is estimated as lowly as that of Baptism by the Socinians. They represent it as a mere commemoration of the death of Christ, the most signal of his acts: and not possessing any virtue in itself to serve us; whatever benefits we receive from Christ being independent of it, and enjoyed by us already[1]; a doctrine, in both its features different from that of our Church, which maintains that the Lord's Supper is a continual remembrance of the *sacrifice* of the death of Christ; and that in it our souls are strengthened and refreshed by *the body and blood of Christ*. Let us see, then, on which side are the Fathers.

Now, whatever difficulty there may be in fixing with precision the notion of the Eucharist entertained by the Fathers, and reducing the numberless passages in which they speak of it to a perfect whole; this may be safely affirmed, that the entire current of their testimony is as much opposed to the Socinian Catechism as it is possible to imagine testimony to be: it sets quite in another direction. Bearing the Socinian theory in mind, let any man contemplate the following passages of the Fathers, and consider for himself whether they are not altogether conceived in a different spirit.

[1] Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, ch. iii.

"We ought to do all things," says Clemens Romanus, "in order, whatever the Lord hath commanded us to do. He hath commanded that our oblations and liturgical offices be at stated seasons, and not be an affair of chance . . . . They, therefore, who make these oblations at the stated seasons are accepted and blessed."[1] It is impossible not to suppose that these oblations referred to the Eucharist, and consequently that the term *προσφορὰ* was applied to it even in the time of Clemens in some sense or other. The case is rendered more certain by a similar but fuller expression which occurs subsequently, "It will be no small sin, if we cast out of their Episcopal office men who have *offered their gifts* holily and without blame."[2]

Justin Martyr, after quoting Malachi i. 11, where God says, that he will not accept the offering of the Jews, but will have in every place incense offered to his name and a pure offering (*θυσία καθαρά*),—explains, that God is here prophesying of the sacrifices which are offered to him by the Gentiles, namely the bread of the Eucharist and the wine of the Eucharist[3]: moreover, the quotation, and the application of it too, is made three several times in the course of this Dialogue.[4] Again, after alluding to the type contained in the Paschal Lamb, and that in the scape-goat, and the goat for sacrifice, he adds, "The oblation also of the fine flour, which those who are cleansed from leprosy were required to make, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist, which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to offer in remembrance of the Passion which he suffered for men, who have their souls thus purged from all evil; so that at one and the same time we may give God thanks for having created the world and all things in it for man, and for having delivered us from the evil in which we were born."[5] But in the Apology, addressed to Gentiles, with whom the sacrificial texts of the Levitical law, which give a complexion to his whole argument in the Dialogue addressed to the Jews, would be out of place, he rather advances the other view of the mystical character of

[1] Clemens Romanus, Ad Corinth. I. § xl.

[2] § xliv.

[3] *Περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὑφ' ἡμῶν τῶν ἐθνῶν προσφερομένων αὐτῷ θυσιῶν, τουτέστι τοῦ ἄρτου τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ τοῦ ποτηρίου ὁμοίως τῆς εὐχαριστίας, προλέγει τότε εἰπὼν καὶ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ δοξάζειν ἡμᾶς, ὑμᾶς δὲ βεβηλοῦν.*—Justin Martyr, Dial. § 41.

[4] § 28, § 117.

[5] § 41.

the Eucharist, as communicating to us the Body and Blood of Christ; saying, "And this food is called by us the Eucharist, whereof it is not lawful for any to partake except those who believe that the things taught by us are true, and who have been washed in the laver for the remission of sins, and for regeneration, and who live as Christ hath commanded. For we do not receive these things as common bread, or as a common cup; but, as through the word of God, Jesus Christ our Saviour becoming incarnate, took flesh and blood for our salvation, so are we taught that the food over which thanksgiving has been made through the prayer of that word which came from him—by which food our blood and flesh are nourished, by its conversion into them—is the Body and Blood of that Jesus who was made flesh."[1] Justin did not exclude from his meaning of the word "oblations" the material elements before consecration, which were brought to the altar; and a fragment of Irenæus, to which I shall presently advert, seems to encourage this notion; still the main feature of his picture of the Eucharist is this, that it is a *commemoration* only of the sacrifice of Christ, though itself called, by a common metonymy, a sacrifice. That such is Justin's view, and that he had no intention of representing the Eucharist to be a material sacrifice (whatever he might say of the fruits as a material oblation), is plain from a well-known passage in the Dialogue; where he understands the Eucharist as a sacrifice in no other sense than as prayer is a sacrifice. "That prayers and thanksgivings made by the worthy are the only sacrifices which are perfect and well-pleasing to God, I myself admit, for these are the only ones which Christians have received it in charge to offer, even in the commemoration of their food, dry and liquid, in which *remembrance is made of the Passion which the Son of God suffered for them.*"[2] But it is obvious that in thus analysing the meaning of Justin, the temptation to rescue him from the Socinian is not the smallest possible. The Socinian, so far from considering the Eucharist a sacrifice, does not even con-

[1] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 66.

[2] Ὅτι μὲν οὖν καὶ εὐχαὶ καὶ εὐχαριστίαι, ὑπὸ τῶν ἀξίων γινόμεναι, τέλειαι μόναι καὶ εὐάρεστοί εἰσι τῷ Θεῷ θυσίαι, καὶ αὐτός φημι. Ταῦτα γὰρ μόνα καὶ Χριστιανοὶ παρέλαβον ποιεῖν, καὶ ἐπ' ἀναμνήσει δὲ τῆς τροφῆς αὐτῶν ξηρᾶς τε· καὶ ὑγρᾶς, ἐν ᾗ καὶ τοῦ πάθους, ὃ πέπονθε δι' αὐτοὺς ὁ Υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ, μέμνηται. — Justin Martyr, Dial. § 117.

sider it symbolical of a sacrifice; whilst our only difficulty with respect to Justin is to discover the sense in which he understands it to be a sacrifice; for that he does so understand it in some sense or other is indisputable. The Socinian, so far from teaching that we are partakers of Christ's body really but spiritually, pronounces such opinion to be "out of the question;"[1] whilst in Justin's case, his assertion of Christ's presence in the Eucharist is so marked, that our only care is to show (and it most clearly can be shown) by such expressions used by him as "food liquid and solid,"[2] "memorials of Christ's Body and Blood,"[3] "sacrifice" of the same kind as prayer,[4] in relation to the Eucharist, that he could have no idea of a corporal presence.

Turn we next to Irenæus, whose language, inartificial as it is, like that of Justin, will be found substantially to convey the same impressions; the argument often drawn from the same premises, and requiring the same construction to be put on it. "The Lord took of his *creatures*, even bread, and gave thanks, and said, This is my Body; and in like manner the cup, another of his *creatures*, he pronounced to be his Blood; and set forth this new *oblation* of the New Testament: an oblation which the Church, having received it from the Apostles, offers up to God the whole world through; to God, who provides us with *food*; these being the *first-fruits* of his gifts under the New Testament, touching which Malachi spake, saying, 'In every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering, for my name shall be great among the Gentiles.'"[5] And again, "Moreover, oblations are not reprobated in themselves" (Irenæus is here alluding to expressions in the prophets, which he had been quoting, to the disparagement of sacrifice) "for there were *oblations* amongst the Jews, and there were oblations amongst us; *sacrifices* amongst the people, and sacrifices in the Church; only the nature of them is changed."[6] And again, in a remarkable passage, "This oblation the Church, and the Church only, offers pure to the Creator, when she offers him a portion of his own *creatures with thanksgiving*. For the Jews make no

[1] Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetical Office, ch. iii. Locum habere nequit.
[2] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 117.
[3] § 70.
[4] § 117.
[5] Irenæus, IV. c. xvii. § 5.
[6] c. xviii. § 2.

such offering, their hands being full of blood, neither have they received the Word which is offered to God."[1] Now certain terms in these extracts from Irenæus seem to imply, as before, that the bread and wine brought to the altar, and out of which the elements were to be taken, are to be considered a material offering of the fruits of the earth; an emphasis being laid on them as God's creatures, and as our food; Irenæus (as was the case with Justin before him, perhaps,) having probably in contemplation the Gnostic heresy, which denied to God his own creation, assigning it to a Demiurgus, and so finding a token of the orthodox Christian's allegiance to the one true God in his oblation of the first-fruits of the earth. But, however we may admit this partial and subordinate view of the elements to have entered into the contemplation of Irenæus, as it seemed before to do into that of Justin, still the broad light in which he also regarded the Eucharist, was that of a commemorative, not a material sacrifice. And the distinction I am taking appears to be in harmony with a fragment of Irenæus given by Pfaffius, "For the offering of the Eucharist is not carnal, but spiritual; and so, pure. For we offer to God the bread and the cup of blessing, giving thanks unto Him for having commanded the earth to bring forth *these* fruits for our food. *And then, having completed the oblation,* we invoke the Holy Ghost that He would render this same *sacrifice,* the bread the Body of Christ, the cup the Blood of Christ; in order that those who partake of these *figures,* may obtain remission of sins and everlasting life. They, therefore, who bring these offerings in remembrance of the Lord, do not approach the opinions of the Jews, but performing a *spiritual service* will be called sons of wisdom."[2] Accordingly, the phrase of Ire-

[1] Et hanc oblationem ecclesia sola puram offert fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creaturâ ejus. Judæi autem non offerunt: manus enim eorum sanguine plenæ sunt: non enim receperunt Verbum, quod offertur Deo. —Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 4.

[2] *Διότι καὶ ἡ προσφορὰ τῆς εὐχαριστιας οὐκ ἔστι σαρκική, ἀλλὰ πνευματικὴ καὶ ἐν τούτῳ καθαρά. Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ Θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ, ὅτι τῇ γῇ ἐκέλευσεν ἐκφῦσαι τοὺς καρποὺς τούτους εἰς τροφὴν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσφορὰν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποφήνῃ τὴν θυσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαβόντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων, τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου τύχωσιν. Οἱ οὖν ταύτας τὰς προσφορὰς ἐν τῇ ἀναμνήσει τοῦ Κυρίου ἄγοντες, οὐ τοῖς τῶν Ἰουδαίων δόγμασι προσέρχονται, ἀλλὰ πνευματικῶς λειτουργοῦντες τῆς σοφίας υἱοὶ κληθήσονται.*—Irenæus, Frag. xxxviii. p. 26, Bened. Ed.

næus in reference to the ulterior progress of the rite is, not merely that the bread and the wine were offered to God as creatures, though this he says, but "as creatures with thanksgiving," *i. e.* the elements, together with their consecration, were offered; the Eucharist in short was the oblation; but in no material sense: for he himself explains the "incense," which Malachi couples with the "pure offering," of the "prayers of the saints;"[1] and "the altar," to which the gifts are to be brought, as an altar in heaven[2]; what forbids, then, "the pure offering" to represent the clean heart, the cheerful alms, the grateful service of the communicants; to all which portions of the rite he himself points, in commenting upon the expression of Malachi[3]; and which must go along with that lively representation or showing forth of the death of Christ, which the Lord himself appointed, and which Irenæus describes by the phrase, "The Lord took of his creatures, gave thanks over them, called them his Body and Blood, and so instituted the new oblation of the New Testament;"[4] "an oblation," he afterwards adds,[5] "which the Jews could not make, because they had not received the Word which is offered;" not, however, in this instance, perhaps, offered in the Eucharist, even commemoratively, though such may be the sense, but offered on the Cross: unless indeed another reading be preferred, *per quod* offertur Deo, "*through whom* it is offered to God." So much for the *commemorative* nature of this right as understood by Irenæus. With respect to the other aspect of it, the communion which it is of the Body and Blood of Christ, this doctrine is asserted plainly enough in the following places: "For if the flesh be not saved, then did not the Lord redeem us by his Blood, neither is the cup of the Eucharist the communion of his Blood, nor the bread which we break the communion of his Body."[6] And again, "Christ has declared the cup, which is of the creature, to be *his own Blood* which was shed, wherewith he moistens our blood; and the bread, which is of the creature, to be his own Body, with which he causes

[1] Incensa autem Joannes in Apocalypsi orationes esse ait sanctorum.—Contra Hæret. IV. c. xvii. § 6.

[2] Altare in cœlis, illuc enim preces nostræ et oblationes diriguntur.—c. xviii. § 6.

[3] § 3, § 4.

[4] c. xvii. § 5.

[5] c. xviii. § 4.

[6] Si autem non salvetur hæc, videlicet nec Dominus sanguine suo redemit nos; neque calix eucharistiæ communicatio sanguinis ejus est, neque panis quem frangimus, communicatio corporis ejus est.—V. c. ii. § 2.

our bodies to grow," *i. e.* not materially through transubstantiation, for he had just before said, it was by God's *creatures* that our bodies were nourished, no substantial change therefore taking place in the elements [1]; but, as he himself goes on to tell us in explanation, "the *true man*, consisting of flesh, and nerves, and bones, is nourished by the cup which is his Blood, and is increased by the bread which is his Body. And like as a branch of the vine, put into the ground, brings forth fruit in its season; and a grain of wheat, falling to the ground and there dissolved, riseth again with manifold increase by the Spirit of God which containeth all things; and they afterwards, by Divine wisdom, serve for the use of man, and receiving the Word of God, become the Eucharist, which is the Body and Blood of Christ; so, also, our bodies being fed by it (viz. the Eucharist), and laid in the ground, after dissolving there, shall yet rise in their season by means of the Divine Logos vouchsafing them a resurrection to the glory of God the Father." [2] That is, the elements after consecration receiving the Word, become the Body and Blood of Christ, and impart by virtue thereof to the flesh a principle of immortality. For the Word communicating through the Eucharist with the soul, is thus brought into connection with the flesh, and so renders the flesh capable of rising again; the spiritual man made "a member of the Body of Christ, of his flesh and of his bones, not by a natural, but by a spiritual union." [3] The faulty part of this view of the Eucharist, Dr. Waterland, in a passage I have already applied from him to Baptism, considers to be this, that Irenæus seems to superinduce the Logos upon the symbols themselves, rather than

[1] Ἐπειδὴ μέλη αὐτοῦ ἐσμέν, καὶ διὰ τῆς κτίσεως τρεφόμεθα.—Irenæus, V. c. ii. § 2. See Philalethes Cantabrigiensis, p. 118.

[2] Οὐ περὶ πνευματικοῦ τινὸς καὶ ἀοράτου ἀνθρώπου λέγων ταῦτα· τὸ γὰρ πνεῦμα οὔτε ὀστέα οὔτε σάρκα ἔχει· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἀληθινὸν ἄνθρωπον οἰκονομίας, τῆς ἐκ σαρκὸς καὶ νεύρων καὶ ὀστέων συνεστώσης· ἥτις καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ποτηρίου αὐτοῦ, ὅ ἐστι τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ, τρέφεται, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ ἄρτου, ὅ ἐστι τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ, αὔξεται. Καὶ ὅνπερ τρόπον τὸ ξύλον τῆς ἀμπέλου κλιθὲν εἰς τὴν γῆν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ ἐκαρποφόρησε, καὶ ὁ κόκκος τοῦ σίτου πεσὼν εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθεὶς, πολλοστὸς ἠγέρθη διὰ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ συνέχοντος τὰ πάντα· ἔπειτα δὲ διὰ τῆς σοφίας τοῦ Θεοῦ εἰς χρῆσιν ἐλθόντα ἀνθρώπων, καὶ προσλαμβανόμενα τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, εὐχαριστία γίνεται, ὅπερ ἐστὶ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ· οὕτως καὶ τὰ ἡμέτερα σώματα ἐξ αὐτῆς τρεφόμενα καὶ τεθέντα εἰς τὴν γῆν καὶ διαλυθέντα ἐν αὐτῇ ἀναστήσεται ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ καιρῷ, τοῦ Λόγου τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν ἔγερσιν αὐτοῖς χαριζομένου εἰς δόξαν Θεοῦ καὶ Πατρός.—Irenæus, V. c. ii. § 3.

[3] Philalethes Cantabrigiensis, p. 119.

upon the recipients. I agree with him, however, in the remark which he subjoins, that the inaccuracy is rather verbal than real; for certainly, when Irenæus was enlarging on the Eucharist in its other character, as a commemorative offering, he insisted on the *purity* of the parties as necessary in order to render the commemorative oblation effective. "It must be made," says he, "with a clean heart, in faith, without hypocrisy, in steadfast hope, in fervent charity."[1] And he then adds, that the Jews did not make it, nor yet many of the heretics; the rite in both these instances, according to Irenæus, being vitiated by a defective faith.

Clemens Alexandrinus does not happen to enlarge on the Eucharist in its aspect as a commemorative sacrifice. Casual expressions, however, occasionally escape from him, which show that the idea itself was familiar to his mind. For instance, "To those who lack understanding, saith Wisdom, that is to the heretics, I suggest, touch the bread which is secret, for it is pleasant, and the theft of water, which is sweet[2]; where Scripture evidently speaks of the bread and the water in reference to the heretics who adopt bread and water for an oblation, contrary to the Canon of the Church. For some persons there are who celebrate the Eucharist in water only."[3] We have certainly here a sacrificial view of the Eucharist presented to us, and the defect of those pointed out who used water instead of wine, or rather instead of wine and water, for a symbol; that defect consisting in an element being chosen which did not express the blood of the victim that purged away sin; the offenders appearing to have been Humanitarians.[4] But of the Eucharist in its other character of sacramental or symbolical food, as the Body and Blood of Christ by which our souls are strengthened and refreshed,

[1] Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere, et in omnibus gratos inveniri fabricatori Deo, in sententiâ purâ et fide sine hypocrisi, in spe firmâ, in dilectione ferventi.—Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 4.

[2] Prov. ix. 17.

[3] Καὶ τοῖς ἐνδεέσι φρενῶν, παρακελεύομαι, λέγουσα, φησὶν ἡ Σοφία, τοῖς ἀμφὶ τὰς αἱρέσεις δηλονότι· ἄρτων κρυφίων ἡδέως ἅψασθε, καὶ ὕδατος κλοπῆς γλυκεροῦ· ἄρτον καὶ ὕδωρ οὐκ ἐπ' ἄλλων τινῶν, ἀλλ' ἢ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρτῳ καὶ ὕδατι κατὰ τὴν προσφοράν, μὴ κατὰ τὸν κανόνα τῆς Ἐκκλησίας, χρωμένων αἱρέσεων, ἐμφανῶς ταττούσης τῆς γραφῆς. Εἰσὶ γὰρ οἳ καὶ ὕδωρ ψιλὸν εὐχαριστοῦσιν. —Stromat. I. § xix. p. 375.

[4] Vani autem et Ebionæi, unctionem Dei et hominis per fidem non recipientes in suam animam . . . . Reprobant itaque hi commixtionem vini cœlestis, et solam aquam sæcularem volunt esse; non recipientes Deum ad commixtionem suam.—Irenæus, V. c. i. § 3.

Clemens repeatedly tells us: indeed, the temper of his mind would naturally lead him to dwell on such a subject. Thus, in common with the early Fathers in general, and in direct opposition to the Racovian Catechism,[1] he applies our Lord's language in the sixth chapter of St. John to the Eucharist. "But since he said, 'And the bread which I will give is my flesh;' and the flesh is moistened by blood; and wine is figuratively called blood; we must understand that as bread crumbled into the mixed cup appropriates the wine, but rejects the aqueous portion; so the flesh of the Lord, the bread from heaven, absorbs the blood; *i. e. nourishes heavenly men unto immortality*, but rejects carnal lusts, and leaves them to destruction. Thus the Word is expressed by different figures, as meat, flesh, food, bread, blood, milk."[2] Again, the subject of drinking, one of the themes of the Pædagogue, leads to a still more distinct enunciation of the doctrine of the Communion of Christ's Body and Blood, whereby the soul, as our Catechism affirms, and as the Racovian Catechism denies, is strengthened and refreshed. "The wine is mingled with the water, the Spirit with the man; the one, the mixture, cheers to faith; the other, the Spirit, guides to incorruption. But the mingling of both, that is, of the drink and of the Word, is called the Eucharist, a famous and excellent grace; whereof they who partake in faith, are *sanctified by it both body and soul*: the paternal will mystically combining man, the divine mixture, with the Spirit and the Word."[3] I know not that it is worth while to multiply quotations to the same effect; a large proportion of which would be found, at the same time

[1] Quid vero statuendum est de corporis et sanguinis Christi usu, John vi. 35, 48, 54 . . . ? Non agit eo loco Christus de cœnâ suâ.—Racovian Catechism, Of Christ's Prophetic Office, c. iii.

[2] Ἐπεὶ δὲ εἶπεν, καὶ ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω, ἡ σάρξ μου ἔστιν· σὰρξ δὲ αἵματι ἄρδεται· τὸ δὲ αἷμα οἶνος ἀλληγορεῖται· ἰστέον οὖν ὅτι ὡς ἄρτος εἰς κρᾶμα καταθρυβεὶς, τὸν οἶνον ἁρπάζει, τὸ δὲ ὑδατῶδες ἀπολείπει· οὕτω καὶ ἡ σὰρξ τοῦ Κυρίου, ὁ ἄρτος τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀναπίνει τὸ αἷμα· τοὺς οὐρανίους τῶν ἀνθρώπων εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ἐκτρέφων, ἀπολείπων δὲ μόνας ἐκείνας εἰς φθοράν, τὰς σαρκικὰς ἐπιθυμίας· οὕτως πολλαχῶς ἀλληγορεῖται ὁ Λόγος, καὶ βρῶμα, καὶ σὰρξ, καὶ τροφὴ, καὶ ἄρτος, καὶ αἷμα, καὶ γάλα.—Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. vi. p. 125.

[3] Κίρναται ὁ μὲν οἶνος τῷ ὕδατι, τῷ δὲ ἀνθρώπῳ τὸ Πνεῦμα· καὶ τὸ μὲν εἰς πίστιν εὐωχεῖ, τὸ κρᾶμα· τὸ δὲ εἰς ἀφθαρσίαν ὁδηγεῖ, τὸ Πνεῦμα· ἡ δὲ ἀμφοῖν αὖθις κρᾶσις, ποτοῦ τε καὶ Λόγου, Εὐχαριστία κέκληται, χάρις ἐπαινουμένη καὶ καλὴ ἧς οἱ κατὰ πίστιν μεταλαμβάνοντες ἁγιάζονται καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχήν· τὸ θεῖον κρᾶμα, τὸν ἄνθρωπον, τοῦ πατρικοῦ βουλεύματος Πνεύματι καὶ Λόγῳ συγκίναντος μυστικῶς.—II. c. ii. p. 177.

that they assert the real presence, to imply that the corporal presence was not thought of. Thus, "he shall bind his foal to the vine, that is," says Clemens, "he shall bind this simple and infant people (the Christian converts) to the Word, which is called the vine by a figure; for the vine bears wine, as the Word, Blood; and both are drunk by man to his salvation: the wine being for his body's health, the Blood for his spirit's:"[1] where the Blood of Christ is evidently understood in a spiritual and not in a physical sense. "Scripture calls the wine the *mystical symbol* of the holy Blood."[2] "The holy fluid of joy expresses, in a figure, the Word who was poured forth for many, for the remission of sins."[3] "Melchizedek" (whom Clemens appears to regard as a personification of the Saviour himself) "was king of Salem, and Priest of the most high God, and gave wine and bread, *consecrated food*, as a type of the Eucharist."[4] From such early times, according to the Fathers, was this great mystery of the Eucharist announced, and with such solemnity was the way prepared for it. How altogether unlike the Socinian reading of it!

In Tertullian, who is our next witness, we have both views of the Sacrament upheld—the commemorative sacrifice—the spiritual food. Thus he speaks of the "wine which Christ consecrated to the *memory of his Blood*."[5] Again, on another occasion, after contending for the Pax or salutation not being withheld under certain circumstances, when some hesitated to admit it, he proceeds to touch on a kindred scruple—whether on the regular service days, Wednesdays and Fridays, the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was to be attended, superseding, as it might seem to do, the Office of the day. "Many think," says he, "that on the days of the stations they ought

[1] Καὶ τὸν πῶλον, φησὶ, προσέδησεν ἀμπέλῳ· ἁπλοῦν τοῦτον καὶ νήπιον λαὸν τῷ Λόγῳ προσδήσας, ὃν ἄμπελον ἀλληγορεῖ. Φέρει γὰρ οἶνον ἡ ἄμπελος, ὡς αἷμα ὁ Λόγος· ἄμφω δὲ ἀνθρώποις ποτὸν εἰς σωτηρίαν· ὁ μὲν οἶνος, τῷ σώματι· τὸ δὲ αἷμα, τῷ πνεύματι.—Clem. Alex. Pædag. I. c. v. pp. 106, 107.

[2] Μυστικὸν ἄρα σύμβολον ἡ γραφὴ αἵματος ἁγίου οἶνον ὠνόμασεν.—II. c. ii. p. 184.

[3] Καὶ εὐλόγησέν γε τὸν οἶνον, εἰπὼν, Λάβετε, πίετε· τοῦτό μου ἐστὶν τὸ αἷμα, αἷμα τῆς ἀμπέλου· τὸν Λόγον, τὸν περὶ πολλῶν ἐκχεόμενον εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν, εὐφροσύνης ἅγιον ἀλληγορεῖ νᾶμα.—II. c. ii. p. 186.

[4] Βασιλεὺς Σαλὴμ, ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ Θεοῦ τοῦ ὑψίστου, ὁ τὸν οἶνον καὶ τὸν ἄρτον τὴν ἡγιασμένην διδοὺς τροφὴν εἰς τύπον εὐχαριστίας.—Stromat. IV. § xxv. p. 637.

[5] Quod in sanguinis sui memoriam consecravit.—Tertullian, De Animâ, c. xvii.

not to attend the Prayers of the *Sacrifices*, because the station ought to be broken up, when the Body of the Lord has been received. Does, then, the Eucharist break up a Service devoted to God? Nay, does it not rather bind it to God? Will not your station be the more solemn, if you stand *at the altar of God too?* The Body of the Lord received and reserved, both are safe, the participation in the sacrifice, and the performance of the Service"[1]—the Eucharist a sacrifice; the place of its celebration an altar. But how do we read elsewhere? "We sacrifice for the safety of the Emperor, but it is to our God and his; and it is after the manner our God prescribes, by *pure prayer;*"[2] that is, by the prayer for the Catholic Church in the primitive Communion Service, one clause of which was in behalf of the Emperor, as the corresponding clause is still retained in our own; and this is here represented by Tertullian as an integral part of the *sacrifice.*

And, indeed, how far this Father was from seeing the material flesh of Christ in the oblation will be evident from the sense in which he understood the real presence, or the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist; the other phase of this Sacrament, to which we will now turn. Thus he speaks of Christ "having consecrated his Blood in the wine;"[3] of "feeding on the fatness of the Lord's Body in the Eucharist;"[4] of "the flesh feeding on the Body and Blood of Christ, that the soul may be fatted of God;"[5] strong expressions, certainly; the last argument, however, being, that the flesh, for the resurrection of which he is pleading, possessed a dignity which would make it a fit subject for being raised again; a dignity derived to it, as from other circumstances, so from the circumstance of its Sacramental alliance with the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist; whereby, whilst the bread and wine are con-

[1] Similiter et stationum diebus non putant plerique sacrificiorum orationibus interveniendum, quod statio solvenda sit, accepto corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia resolvit? An magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini, et reservato, utrumque salvum est, et participatio sacrificii, et executio officii.—De Oratione, c. xix.

[2] Itaque et sacrificamus pro salute Imperatoris, sed Deo nostro et ipsius: sed quomodo præcepit Deus, purâ prece.—Ad Scapulam, c. ii.

[3] Sanguinem suum in vino consecravit.—Adversus Marcionem IV. c. xl.

[4] Atque ita exinde opimitate Dominici corporis vescitur, Eucharistiâ scilicet.—De Pudicitiâ, c. ix.

[5] Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima Deo saginetur.—De Resurrectione Carnis, c. viii.

sumed by the flesh, the spiritual Body and Blood of Christ are conveyed to the soul through its connection with the flesh. But in the same treatise, when answering an objection to the disparagement of the flesh, deduced from the text, "the flesh profiteth nothing," he contends that the apparent meaning of it is to be qualified; that inasmuch as the Jews thought Christ's saying hard and intolerable, as though he had affirmed *that his flesh was really to be eaten by them*, he premised, in order to refer the state of salvation to the spirit, "the spirit it is which giveth life," and then he added, "the flesh profiteth nothing," that is, so far as giving life was concerned. . . . . Thus constituting the Word the giver of life, because the Word is spirit and life, he called the same his flesh, because the Word was made flesh, and so was to be sought after for the sake of life, and to be *devoured by hearing*, and to be *masticated by the understanding, and to be digested by faith.*"[1] Tertullian, it is true, does not here speak of the Eucharist in direct terms, but he alludes to the language of the sixth chapter of St. John, which the Fathers in general, as we have seen, interpret of the Eucharist, and which, in the next quotation I shall make, seems to be so understood by Tertullian himself; nor could that Sacrament be out of his thoughts when he was writing; and his reasoning, we see, is, that it was not the material flesh of Christ which was to be eaten to give life; but the Word, which is spirit, to be eaten by the spiritual part of the man, through faith. The passage in which he considers the sixth chapter of St. John as bearing on the Eucharist, and which itself also illustrates his idea of the real presence, and confirms what I have said already, is in his exposition of the Lord's Prayer. The clause, "Give us this day our daily bread," he would have taken in a spiritual sense; "for Christ is our bread, because Christ is life, and bread is life. I am the bread of life, saith he. And a little before, the bread is the Word of

[1] Sic etsi carnem ait nihil prodesse, ex materiâ dicti dirigendus est sensus. Nam quia durum et intolerabilem existimaverunt sermonem ejus, quasi vere carnem suam illis edendam determinasset; ut in spiritum disponeret statum salutis, præmisit: Spiritus est qui vivificat; atque ita subjunxit, Caro nihil prodest; ad vivificandum scilicet . . . . Itaque sermonem constituens vivificatorem, quia spiritus et vita sermo, eundem etiam carnem suam dixit, quia et sermo caro erat facta, proinde in causam vitæ appetendus et devorandus auditu, et ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus.—De Resurrectione Carnis, c. xxxvii.

the living God which came down from heaven. Then again, because in the bread is understood his Body. This is my Body. Wherefore in praying for daily bread, we pray to be perpetually in Christ, and undivided from his Body."[1] The juxta-position in which Tertullian here places the Lord's appointment of the Eucharist, and his speech in the sixth chapter of St. John, shows that he considers the latter to involve that Sacrament. The passages I have adduced, then, may suffice to prove on the one hand that Tertullian believed in the real presence, on the other that he did not believe in the corporal. Other conclusions against the Romish doctrine I have extracted from him in a former Lecture,[2] and shall not repeat them now.

Hippolytus, in a fragment of a commentary on Prov. ix. 1, offers us the two views of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, which I have been bringing before you, very distinctly in one and the same paragraph. "'She hath furnished her table,' *i. e.* the knowledge of the Holy Trinity which had been promised; and his precious and unpolluted Body and Blood, which in the mystical and Divine table *are daily sacrificed in remembrance of that first and ever memorable table of the mystical and Divine supper.* 'She hath sent forth her servants,' *i. e.* Wisdom or Christ hath called them together with a loud cry, saying, 'Whoso is simple, let him turn in hither to me;' by those servants meaning the holy Apostles who were to traverse the whole world, and call the nations truly to the knowledge of him by their sublime and divine publication of these things. 'To them that want understanding,' *i. e.* to those who did not yet possess the power of the Holy Ghost, she saith, 'Come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine which I have mingled,' *i. e. his Divine Flesh and his precious Blood, which he hath given us to eat and to drink for the remission of sins.*"[3]

[1] Quanquam panem nostrum quotidianum da nobis hodie, spiritualiter potius intelligamus. Christus enim panis noster est, quia vita Christus, et vita panis. Ego sum, inquit, panis vitæ. Et paulo supra: Panis est sermo Dei vivi, qui descendit de cœlis. Tum quod et corpus ejus in pane censetur. Hoc est corpus meum. Itaque petendo panem quotidianum, perpetuitatem postulamus in Christo, et individuitatem a corpore ejus.—De Oratione, c. vi.

[2] Lecture II. First Series.

[3] Καὶ ἡτοιμάσατο τὴν ἑαυτῆς τράπεζαν, τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τῆς ἁγίας Τριάδος κατεπαγγελλομένην. Καὶ τὸ τίμιον καὶ ἄχραντον αὐτοῦ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα, ἅπερ ἐν τῇ μυστικῇ καὶ θείᾳ τραπέζῃ καθ' ἑκάστην ἐπιτελοῦνται θυόμενα εἰς ἀνάμνησιν τῆς ἀειμνήστου καὶ πρώτης

Origen yields a similar testimony to that of the other Fathers on both the features of the Eucharist I am investigating. First, with respect to the commemorative sacrifice. "The divine Scripture saith, 'And he shall put the incense upon the fire before the Lord, that the cloud of the incense may cover the mercy seat that is upon the testimony, that he die not; and he shall take of the blood of the bullock, and sprinkle it with his finger upon the mercy seat eastward.' This shows how the rite of *propitiation for men to Godwards was celebrated.* But do not you, who are come to Christ, the true High Priest, who hath rendered God propitious to you by his Blood, and reconciled you to his Father, do not you stop short in the *blood of the flesh;* but rather acquaint yourself with the Blood of the Word, and hear him saying unto you, 'for this is my Blood which shall be shed for you for the remission of sins.' He who hath been *imbued with the mystery,* knows both *the Flesh and the Blood of the Word of God.* Let us not then pause on these matters, which are known to the initiated, and cannot be laid open to the ignorant. Moreover do not suppose this sprinkling to the eastward had no meaning. The propitiation came to you from the east. For from that quarter came the man whose name is Oriens (*ἀνατολή*), who was made the Mediator between God and man."[1] This passage, it is true, has reached us only

ἐκείνης τραπέζης τοῦ μυστικοῦ θείου δείπνου. Τὸ δὲ ἀπέστειλε τοὺς ἑαυτῆς δούλους ἡ Σοφιά, ὁ Χριστὸς δηλονότι, συγκαλοῦσα μετὰ ὑψηλοῦ κηρύγματος· ὃς ἐστιν ἄφρων, ἐκκλινάτω πρός με, φάσκουσα, τοὺς ἱερουὺς ἀποστόλους πρόδηλον, τοὺς εἰς τὸν σύμπαντα κόσμον διαδραμόντας καὶ προσκαλέσαντας τὰ ἔθνη εἰς τὴν ἐκείνου ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθῶς τῷ ὑψηλῷ καὶ θείῳ τούτων κηρύγματι. Τὸ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐνδεέσι φρενῶν εἶπε, τοῖς μήπω κεκτημένοις τὴν τοῦ ἁγίου Πνεύματος δύναμιν δηλονότι, ἔλθετε, φάγετε τὸν ἐμὸν ἄρτον, καὶ πίετε οἶνον ὃν κέκρακα ὑμῖν, τὴν θείαν αὐτοῦ σάρκα καὶ τὸ τίμιον αὐτοῦ αἷμα δέδωκεν ἡμῖν, φησὶν, ἐσθίειν καὶ πίνειν εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν.—Hippolytus, Frag. p. 282.

[1] Ait ergo eloquium divinum, et imponet incensum super ignem in conspectu Domini, et operiet fumus incensi propitiatorium quod est super testimonia, et non morietur, et sumet de sanguine vituli, et resperget digito suo super propitiatorium contra orientem (Levit. xvi. 13.) Ritus quidem apud veteres propitiationis pro hominibus, qui fiebat ad Deum, qualiter celebraretur, edocuit: sed tu qui ad Christum venisti, Pontificem verum, qui sanguine suo Deum tibi propitium fecit, et reconciliavit te Patri, non hæreas in sanguine carnis: sed disce potius sanguinem Verbi, et audi ipsum tibi dicentem, quia, Hic sanguis meus est, qui pro vobis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum. Novit, qui mysteriis imbutus est, et carnem et sanguinem Verbi Dei. Non ergo immoremur in his quæ et scientibus nota sunt, et ignorantibus patere non possunt. Quod autem contra orientem respergit, non otiose accipias. Ab ori-

in the Latin translation of Rufinus (for probably his it is[1]), but as a part of the second Homily upon Genesis is preserved in the Greek, and as the version is there found to be close to the original, it is to be presumed that it is generally trustworthy in these Homilies on the books of Moses. And the paragraph before us seems to point plainly enough to the Eucharist as a commemorative sacrifice. It had the nature of a sacrifice in some sense, for the parallel runs between that and the Levitical one, even to minute matters; and it is expressly denied to be a material sacrifice, for the Christian is enjoined not to take so low a view of it as that. What could it be else, then, but commemorative, and significant of the Passion which it represented? The same conclusion would follow from another place in Origen, where the original text is preserved. "'God is a Spirit, and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and in truth:' by which the Saviour taught that we are not to worship God in the flesh, and by *fleshly sacrifices*, but *in the spirit*. For he would be understood to be a Spirit, in proportion as he is worshipped in spirit and with the understanding: but we must not worship the Father in types" (*i. e.* with carnal sacrifices), "but in truth; which truth came by Jesus Christ, subsequent to the law given by Moses."[2] The service which the Christian has to offer is here distinguished from the Judaical in this, that whilst in the one the sacrifices were material, in the other they were spiritual—that of the Eucharist, the very foremost of the Christian offices, of course included, unless Origen, like several of the Fathers before him, may be thought to see in the elements an oblation of fruits; a testimony against the heretics that the earth is the Lord's and not a Demiurgus's, and that our food is from him.[3]

ente tibi propitiatio venit. Inde est enim vir, cui Oriens nomen est, qui Mediator Dei et hominum factus est.—Origen, Homil. ix. in Levit. § 10, vol. ii. p. 243.

[1] See Huetii Origeniana, p. 298, referred to by Dr. Burton, Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, p. 307, 2nd Ed.

[2] Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεὸς, καὶ τοὺς προσκυνοῦντας αὐτὸν ἐν πνεύματι καὶ ἀληθείᾳ δει προσκυνεῖν· δι' ὧν ἐδίδαξεν, ὁτι οὐκ ἐν σαρκὶ δεῖ προσκυνεῖν καὶ σαρκίναις θυσίαις τὸν Θεὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν πνεύματι. Καὶ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἀνάλογον ἐν πνεύματι καὶ νοητῶς λατρεύειν τινὰ αὐτῷ πνεῦμα νοηθείη ἄν. Ἀλλὰ καὶ οὐκ ἐν τύποις προσκυνεῖν δεῖ τῷ Πατρὶ, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀληθείᾳ, ἥτις διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐγένετο, μετὰ τὸ δοθῆναι τὸν νόμον διὰ Μωϋσέως. — Origen, Contra Celsum, VI. § 70.

[3] Ἔστι δὲ καὶ συμβολον ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν εὐχαριστίας, ἄρτος εὐχαριστία καλούμενος. Ἀλλ' οὐδὲ δαίμονες ἔχουσιν, ὡς καὶ ἐν τοῖς

That Origen further contemplated the Eucharist as conveying to the communicant who received it in faith the Body and Blood of Christ to his soul's health, appears from the following passage. "Let Celsus, then, since he is ignorant of God, render his oblations to demons; we, however, studying to please the Maker of the universe, eat the bread which is presented with prayer and thanksgiving for God's good gifts—the bread, I say, which by reason of the prayer becomes a *certain Body, holy in itself*, and *making holy those who partake of it with a good purpose of heart.*"[1] And again, the same view, or nearly the same, is maintained in a remarkable paragraph, in which Origen, who is fond of expatiating and losing himself in a mystical subject, endeavours to explain the nature of the faculty by which the prophets are enabled to foretell future events. There may be simple people who interpret mechanically certain scenes of Scripture, as when it is said that the prophets saw the heavens opened or heard the Lord's voice. "But he who searches deeper will say, that whereas there is a *certain generic Divine sense*, as Scripture calls it, which none but the blessed find out, according to the words of Solomon, 'Thou shalt find out a Divine sense' (*αἴσθησιν θείαν εὑρήσεις*).[2] And whereas there are several kinds of this sense—that of sight, which is fitted to discern better things than those which are corporeal, as the Cherubim and Seraphim; that of hearing, which receives words that do not derive their being from the air; that of taste, which *relishes the living bread, the bread which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world*[3]; that of smell, which smelleth such smells as that which Paul calls a sweet savour of Christ unto God[4]; that of touch, according to which John says, that his hands had handled the Word of life[5]; the blessed prophets, I repeat, finding out this Divine sense, both seeing divinely, and hearing divinely, and tasting divinely, and smelling (so to speak) by this unsensual sense,

ἀνωτέρω ἐλέγομεν, τὴν οἰκονομίαν τῶν πρὸς τὰς ἡμετέρας χρείας δεδημιουργημένων· διὸ οὐδ' ἄδικόν τι πράττομεν, μετέχοντες τῶν δημιουργημάτων, καὶ τοῖς μὴ προσήκουσιν αὐτοῖς μὴ θύοντες.—Contra Celsum, VIII. § 57.

[1] *Καὶ διὰ τοιαῦτα δὲ Κέλσος μὲν, ὡς ἀγνοῶν Θεὸν, τὰ χαριστήρια δαίμοσιν ἀποδιδότω· ἡμεῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ παντὸς δημιουργῷ εὐχαριστοῦντες, καὶ τοὺς μετ' εὐχαριστίας καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους ἐσθίομεν, σῶμα γενομένους διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν ἅγιόν τι καὶ ἁγιάζον τοὺς μετὰ ὑγιοῦς προθέσεως αὐτῷ χρωμένους.*—VIII. § 33.

[2] See Prov. ii. 5.

[3] John vi. 33.

[4] 2 Cor. ii. 15.

[5] 1 John i. 1.

and touching the Word by faith, so that the efflux of it came unto them to heal them, by this means saw what they describe themselves to have seen, and heard what they report themselves to have heard, and were affected in other like ways, as when they eat (so they tell us) the roll of the book that was given them."[1] Moreover the spirit of this passage will serve to correct that of some previous extracts from other Fathers, where the presence of the Lord in the Eucharist seemed to be assigned to the elements rather than to the recipients, and confirms what was observed on one of those occasions, that the error was rather apparent than real, and that the Fathers meant in general to convey the notion without any technical nicety, that whatever might be the mode, the Body and Blood of Christ were certainly to be found in that Sacrament.

Of all the early Fathers, none, perhaps, are so full and emphatic on the *sacrificial* character of the Eucharist as Cyprian, insomuch that it may be best to place in the forefront of our quotations from that Father passages which clearly prove, that however strong his language, he nevertheless was all the while regarding the Eucharist not as a repetition of the oblation of Christ once offered, but as a lively *commemoration* of that sacrifice. "Know, then," says he, in a letter to Cæcilius on the Sacrament of the cup, "that we have been admonished, that in offering the cup the tradition of the Lord be observed, and that no other thing be done by us than what the Lord did for us first; to wit, that *the cup which is offered in remembrance of him*, be mixed with wine. For since Christ said, 'I am the true vine,' the Blood of Christ is

[1] Ὁ δὲ βαθύτερον τὸ τοιοῦτον ἐξετάζων ἐρεῖ, ὅτι οὔσης, ὡς ἡ γραφὴ ὠνόμασε, θείας τινὸς γενικῆς αἰσθήσεως, ἣν μόνος ὁ μακάριος εὑρίσκει ἤδη, κατὰ τὸ λεγόμενον καὶ παρὰ τῷ Σολομῶντι, ὅτι αἴσθησιν θείαν εὑρήσεις· καὶ ὄντων εἰδῶν ταύτης τῆς αἰσθήσεως, ὁράσεως πεφυκυίας βλέπειν τὰ κρείττονα σωμάτων πράγματα ἐν οἷς δηλοῦται τὰ Χερουβὶμ ἢ τὰ Σεραφίμ· καὶ ἀκοῆς ἀντιληπτικῆς φωνῶν, οὐχὶ ἐν ἀέρι τὴν οὐσίαν ἐχουσῶν καὶ γεύσεως χρωμένης ἄρτῳ ζῶντι, καὶ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ καταβεβηκότι, καὶ ζωὴν διδόντι τῷ κύσμῳ· οὕτως δὲ καὶ ὀσφρήσεως ὀσφραινομένης τοιῶνδε, καθὸ Χριστοῦ εὐωδία λέγει εἶναι τῷ Θεῷ Παῦλος· καὶ ἁφῆς, καθ' ἣν Ἰωάννης φησὶ ταῖς χερσὶν ἐψηλαφηκέναι περὶ τοῦ Λόγου τῆς ζωῆς· οἱ μακάριοι προφῆται τὴν θείαν αἴσθησιν εὑρόντες, καὶ βλέποντες θείως, καὶ ἀκούοντες θείως, καὶ γευόμενοι ὁμοίως, καὶ ὀσφραινόμενοι (ἵν' οὕτως ὀνομάσω) αἰσθήσει οὐκ αἰσθητῇ, καὶ ἁπτόμενοι τοῦ Λόγου μετὰ πίστεως, ὥστ' ἀπορροὴν αὐτοῦ εἰς αὐτοὺς ἥκειν θεραπεύουσαν αὐτούς, οὕτως ἑώρων ἃ ἀναγράφουσιν ἑωρακέναι καὶ ἤκουον ἃ λέγουσιν ἀκηκοέναι, καὶ τὰ παραπλήσια ἔπασχον, ὡς ἀνέγραφον, κεφαλίδα ἐσθίοντες διδομένην αὐτοῖς βιβλίου.—Origen, Contra Celsum, I. § 48.

not water but wine. Nor can his Blood, by which we are redeemed and quickened, seem to be in the cup when there is no wine in the cup, by which the Blood of Christ is set forth." [1] The purport of this passage is to represent the Eucharist as a *commemorative* sacrifice, but nothing more. And the same is expressed in another paragraph of the same letter still more unequivocally. "If Jesus Christ our Lord and God is himself the High Priest of God, and offered himself first of all a sacrifice to his Father, and commanded this (rite) to be *performed in commemoration of him*, surely that Priest truly discharges his functions in Christ's stead who copies that which Christ did; and then it is he offers a true and full sacrifice in the Church to God the Father, when he is found making his oblation as he has seen Christ make it . . . . Wherefore, as often as we offer the cup in *commemoration of the Lord and of his Passion*, let us do what it appears that our Lord did;" [2] with much more to the same purpose; for though the subject of the letter is the necessity of using wine as a symbol in the Eucharist and not water, still the line of reasoning adopted proves very satisfactorily that the whole was regarded as a commemorative act. Taking these passages, then, as keys to others, we shall be able to construe correctly such expressions as the following, of which Cyprian is full—"The Presbyters who *make the oblations* with the Confessors—" [3] "We ask God's ample blessing upon you, both when *in the sacrifice* we make prayers with the congregation, and when we offer up our petitions in private" [4]—"Priests who daily perform *the sacrifices* of God;" [5] a parallel to,

[1] Admonitos autem nos scias ut in calice offerendo Dominica traditio servetur, neque aliud fiat a nobis quam quod pro nobis Dominus prior fecerit, ut calice qui in commemorationem ejus offertur, mixtus vino offeratur. Nam cum dicat Christus, Ego sum vitis vera, sanguis Christi non aqua est utique, sed vinum. Nec potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice, quando vinum desit calici, quo Christi sanguis ostenditur.—Cyprian, Ep. lxiii. § 2.

[2] Nam si Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster ipse est summus sacerdos Dei Patris, et sacrificium Patri seipsum primus obtulit, et hoc fieri in sui commemorationem præcepit, utique ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur, et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in Ecclesiâ Deo Patri, si sic incipiat offerre secundum quod ipsum Christum videat obtulisse . . . .—§ 14.

Quotiescunque ergo calicem in commemorationem Domini et passionis ejus offerimus, id quod constat Dominum fecisse faciamus.—§ 18.

[3] Presbyteri qui apud confessores offerunt.—Ep. iv.

[4] Quando in sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus.—xv. § 1.

[5] Sacerdotes, qui sacrificia Dei quotidie celebramus.—liv. § 3.

"daily drinking the cup of the Blood of Christ."[1] We find the analogy repeatedly drawn between the Levitical sacrifice and the Eucharist.[2] Mention is repeatedly made of the "altar" in the Church: of "the altar being set up:"[3] of "assisting at God's altar:"[4] of "the Priestly order being wholly occupied in serving at the altar and at the sacrifice:"[5] of "the Priesthood offering sacrifices at the altar:"[6] of one who is "an enemy to the altar, and a rebel against the sacrifice of Christ."[7]

Again, we discover Cyprian recognising no less clearly the Body and Blood of Christ as spiritually present in the Eucharist, and as serving to strengthen the souls of the communicants. "But now it is not for the weak, but for the strong that the Pax is necessary: it is not to the dying, but the living that we have to give the Communion, in order that we may not leave unarmed and naked those whom we excite and exhort to the battle; but may fortify them by the *protection of the Body and Blood of Christ.* And since the Eucharist is expressly for this, that it may be a defence to those who receive it, let us arm those who wish to be safe against the enemy with the muniment of the fatness (or plenteousness) of the Lord."[8] Cyprian too in his turn applies the language of the sixth chapter of St. John to the Eucharist—"We pray that this bread may be given us daily, in order that we who are in Christ, and *daily receive the Eucharist as the food of salvation,* may not be separated from Christ's body by reason of any grievous sin intervening, so that we should be prohibited from partaking of the *heavenly bread.* For Christ himself tells us, I am the bread of life which came down from

[1] Quotidie calicem sanguinis Christi bibere. —Ep. lvi. § 1.

[2] De Lapsis, § xv.; Testimoniorum, III. c. xciv.

[3] Considentibus Dei sacerdotibus et altari posito.—Ep. xlii. § 2.

[4] Ut altari Dei assistat antistes.—lviii. § 2.

Quando singuli divino sacerdotio honorati et in clerico ministerio constituti non nisi altari et sacrificiis deservire et precibus atque orationibus vacare debeant.—lxvi. § 2.

[6] Aut quia Novatianus altare collocare et sacrificia offerre contra fas nititur, ab altari et sacrificiis cessare nos oportet? —lxxiii. § 2.

[7] Hostis altaris, adversus sacrificium Christi rebellis.—De Unitate Ecclesiæ, § xvii.

[8] At vero nunc non infirmis, sed fortibus pax necessaria est: nec morientibus, sed viventibus communicatio a nobis danda est: ut quos excitamus et hortamur ad prælium, non inermes et nudos relinquamus, sed protectione sanguinis et corporis Christi muniamus: et cum ad hoc fiat Eucharistia, ut possit accipientibus esse tutela; quos tutos esse contra adversarium volumus, munimento dominicæ saturitatis armemus. —Ep. liv. § 2.

heaven. If any one shall eat of my bread he shall live for ever; but the bread which I will give him is my flesh for life eternal.[1] Since then he says, that he who shall eat of this bread, lives for ever; as it is manifest that they live who touch his body and receive the Eucharist by virtue of the Communion (or by being entitled to communicate); so on the other hand is it to be feared that he who is prohibited from the Body of Christ is not in a state of salvation."[2] This mystical presence in the Eucharist is further represented by Cyprian, as effected through the agency of the Holy Ghost, who is invoked upon it. "For the oblation," says he, "cannot be sanctified where the Holy Spirit is lacking."[3]

Neither can it be alleged with truth of this Sacrament any more than of the other, that the Fathers regard the *opus operatum* as sufficient to secure the benefits which belong to it. For their language still is, that there must be a fitness in the recipient in order to render its virtues availing. This, indeed, has appeared from quotations already made. According to Justin Martyr, none can partake of it but the faithful and such as are living in obedience to Christ.[4] According to Irenæus, the heart of the worthy communicant must be clean, his faith without hypocrisy, his hope steadfast, his charity fervent.[5] Clemens Alexandrinus considers the previous searching of the heart so much a matter of course, that he takes for granted it is submitted to by all who propose to themselves to partake of the Eucharist—persons actually partaking or not, as their conscience, which is the safest guide, directs: and he uses their case in illustration of another which he considers parallel to theirs.[6] Tertullian expressly calls to the recollection

[1] John vi. 51.

[2] Hunc autem panem dari nobis quotidie postulamus, ne qui in Christo sumus, et Eucharistiam quotidie ad cibum salutis accipimus, intercedente aliquo graviore delicto, dum abstenti et non communicantes a cœlesti pane prohibemur, a Christi corpore separemur, ipso prædicante et monente: Ego sum panis vitæ qui de cœlo descendi. Si quis ederit de meo pane, vivet in æternum. Panis autem quem ego dedero caro mea est pro sæculi vitâ. Quando ergo dicit in æternum vivere si quis ederit de ejus pane, ut manifestum est eos vivere qui corpus ejus attingunt et Eucharistiam jure communicationis accipiunt, ita contra timendum est et orandum ne, dum quis abstentus separatur a Christi corpore, procul remaneat a salute.—De Oratione Dominicâ, § xviii.

[3] Quando nec oblatio sanctificari illic possi ubit Spiritus sanctus non sit.—Ep. lxiv. § 4.

[4] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 66.

[5] Irenæus, IV. c. xviii. § 4.

[6] Ἀνάγκη τοίνυν ἄμφω τούτω δοκιμάζειν σφᾶς αὐτούς· τὸν μέν, εἰ ἄξιος λέγειν τε καὶ ὑπομνήματα καταλιμπάνειν· τὸν δὲ εἰ ἀκροᾶσθαί τε καὶ ἐντυγχάνειν δίκαιος. Ἢ καὶ τὴν Εὐχαριστίαν τινὲς διανείμαντες, ὡς

of parties, who might be tempted to attend the shows, the manner in which they would forfeit by so doing, the engagement this Sacrament had laid them under; quoting pointedly passages from its Service [1]; a use of it in a particular case, which Justin had told us was made of it in general; his testimony being, that Christians were wont to remind one another of their duties by a reference to the Eucharist and the life it pledged them to.[2] Origen, we saw, gave it a sanctifying power for those only who partook of it "with a good purpose of heart." [3] Cyprian insists upon the fear and reverence with which it should be approached, and the purity which should characterize the communicants if they would not draw down upon themselves a curse instead of a blessing.[4] And on another occasion, after enumerating the preparations which were to be made, if we would not be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord, he continues, "If all these precautions be despised; if they partake" (it is of the lapsed he is speaking), "before they have expiated their offences, before they have made confession of their sin, before they have purged their consciences by the prayer and imposition of hands of the Priest; they do violence to the Body and Blood of the Lord, and offend more against him both by their hands and by their mouth, than when they denied the Lord." [5] So that nothing can be more wide of the mark than to suppose, that because the Fathers, in opposition to the Socinian, assign to the Sacrament of the Eucharist a very high position in the scale of the means of grace, they make the virtue which belongs to it, begin and terminate with the act, instead of considering it an incentive to a good life, a powerful auxiliary to it, and a guarantee that it shall be laboured after.

ἔθος, αὐτὸν δὴ ἕκαστον τοῦ λαοῦ λαβεῖν τὴν μοῖραν ἐπιτρέπουσιν. Ἀρίστη γὰρ πρὸς τὴν ἀκριβῆ αἵρεσίν τε καὶ φυγὴν ἡ συνείδησις.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § i. p. 318.

[1] Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. xxv.

[2] Justin Martyr, Apol. I. § 67.

[3] Origen, Contra Celsum, VIII. § 33.

[4] Cum timore et honore Eucharistiam accipiendam. In Levitico: "Anima autem quæcunque manducaverit ex carne sacrificii salutaris, quod est Domini, et immunditia ipsius super ipsum est, peribit anima illa de populo suo." Item ad Corinthios primâ: "Quicunque ederit panem aut biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini." — Cyprian, Testimoniorum, III. c. xciv.

[5] Spretis his omnibus atque contemptis, ante expiata delicta, ante exomologesin factam criminis, ante purgatam conscientiam sacrificio et manu sacerdotis, ante offensam placatam indignantis Domini et minantis, vis infertur corpori ejus et sanguini, et plus modo in Dominum manibus atque ore delinquunt, quam cum Dominum negaverunt.—De Lapsis, § xvi.

LECTURE XIII.

Use of the Fathers in unfolding the *meaning* of Scripture: II. Their testimony opposed to the Calvinistic scheme, 1°. On the freedom of the will. The assertion of it by the Fathers distinct and emphatic. 2°. On the degree of human corruption. The consequences of the Fall recognised by the Fathers, but not in a manner satisfactory to the Calvinist. Their language upon this point dubious and conflicting. Cause of their embarrassment. Illustrations. Vindication of the Fathers from the charge of Pelagianism. Their teaching on the necessity of Divine grace for the recovery and restoration of man.

II.

IT is a further matter of much consequence in our interpretation of Scripture, whether we are disposed to adopt as a general principle the Calvinistic system or not. I mean that the bias on our minds which this system impresses would insensibly make itself felt in the turn we give to our exposition of a great number of texts, the meaning of which admits of debate. Thus as the effect of the former bias discovered itself in the Annotations of Grotius, so the effect of this bias discovers itself in Beza's translation of the New Testament, and through that, in some degree on our own. Now I do not say, that the early Fathers are to decide us peremptorily on this question, but I do think that their testimony upon it, and especially if that testimony be unanimous, is entitled to great consideration. But unanimous it is against the leading doctrines of Calvin. I could produce pages after pages from the early Fathers in support of this assertion, but must confine myself to a few references; a sample from a whole magazine.

§ 1.

On the Freedom of the Will.

Thus Justin Martyr maintains the doctrine of the *freedom of the will*, against the doctrine of necessity, over and over

again. He talks of man "making choice of the better part according to that freedom of will which belongs to him."[1] He insists upon such freedom being requisite in order that man should be rendered accountable for his actions. "If it were decreed that one man should be good and another bad, the former would not be a subject for praise, nor the latter for censure;"[2] with much to the same effect in other places; for the antinomianism of some of the early heretics led the Fathers to express themselves more fully upon this point than perhaps they otherwise would have done.

Irenæus is equally explicit. He maintains the justice of man's condemnation, if condemned he is, on the ground of his will being free.[3] A considerable part of the thirty-seventh chapter of the fourth book is occupied in a discussion of this subject. He argues that they who do good or who do evil, will properly receive reward or punishment, because they respectively had it in their power to do otherwise: that the Scriptures urge men to act right, as if it rested with themselves to do so: and he infers from such texts that God encourages to obedience, but does not force.[4]

Tertullian repeatedly expresses himself to the same purport. "It is not the part of a sound faith," says he, "to refer everything to God's will after such a manner as this; and flatter ourselves that nothing is done without his consent, as though we had no power in ourselves; for at that rate every crime would have its excuse . . . . God sets before us what is and what is not his will, and then we have full choice to follow the one or the other."[5] "God hardened Pharaoh's heart," says he in another place, "but then Pharaoh had *deserved* his ruin to be thus prepared for him, because he had denied God, and repeatedly rejected his ambassadors."[6] I could multiply extracts from him to a great extent, but refrain for the sake of brevity.

Those which Clemens Alexandrinus furnishes of the same character are still more numerous. "God is not to be blamed for the offence of him, who will not choose the best. It is the business of the one party (those who preach) to put out

[1] Justin Martyr, De Monarchiâ, § 6.
[2] Apol. I. § 43.
[3] Irenæus, IV. c. iv. § 3; c. xv. § 2.
[4] IV. c. xxxvii. §§ 2, 3, 4.
[5] Tertullian, De Exhortatione Castitatis, c. ii.
[6] Adversus Marcionem, II. c. xiv.

his word to interest; it is the business of the other party (those who hear) to prove it, and choose it or not; but by their own judgment will they be judged."[1] "To them which are called, both Jews and Gentiles, (we preach) Christ, the power of God and the wisdom of God:" on which again Clemens remarks, "All mankind then being called, they who *are willing to obey*, are named the called: for there is no unrighteousness with God: but they of either race, who believe, are his peculiar people."[2]

Origen is of the same mind. Celsus has suggested that the moral world, like the physical, is made up of a series of revolutions; the positive amount of evil in it being a constant quantity. In reply to this, Origen contends that such a theory would be destructive of the principle of free-will: that in such case it became a matter of *necessity* that Socrates should philosophize, and be accused of introducing new Gods, and of corrupting the youth; and that Anytus and Melitus should bring the charge against him; and the Areopagus condemn him to death; and in like manner, that when the cycle came round, Phalaris should play the tyrant, and so on: under which circumstances, adds Origen, "I know not how our volition can be secured, or how there will be any room for praise or blame."[3] "Take away volition," says he, "from virtue and you take away its very essence."[4] In his treatise on prayer he has an express dissertation on the freedom of the will; naturally led to it by his subject, and the necessity of showing that the effect of prayer was not destroyed, as it would be by fixed decrees.[5] Numerous other extracts might be produced from this Father of a similar kind; but it may suffice to refer once for all to the first chapter of the third book "De Principiis," of which the Greek is preserved (and therefore the evidence above suspicion) in the Philocalia; the title of the chapter being, "Concerning the freedom of the will, with a solution and explanation of those passages in Scripture which may seem to deny it;" and the character of it to be gathered from the following paragraph, "Since then there are myriads of texts in Scripture which very clearly set

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. I. § i. p. 318.
[2] Stromat. I. c. xviii. p. 371.
[3] Origen, Contra Celsum, IV. § 67.
[4] "Οτι ἀρετῆς μὲν ἐάν ἀνέλῃς τὸ ἑκούσιον, ἀνείλες αὐτῆς καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν. —§ 3.
[5] De Oratione, §§ 5, 6.

forth the freedom of the will; but at the same time there are certain expressions in the Old and New Testament which tend to the contrary, that is to say, imply that it does not rest with ourselves to keep the Commandments and be saved, or to transgress them and perish; let us produce several of these, and consider the solution of them: that so, in like manner, any man may understand for himself the solution of all those which seem to extinguish the freedom of the will."[1]

Cyprian is no less decided on the question than the others. "What wonder is it," writes he to Cornelius, "that the Lord's minister, the Bishop, should be forsaken, when the Lord himself was, who said to his disciples, 'Will ye also go away?' where he had regard to that law by which a man, left to his liberty, and established in *his own free-will*, chooses for himself either death or salvation."[2] "The Apostle John," says he again, "execrates and reproves those who depart from the Church—'They went out from us, but they were not of us; for if they had been of us, they would no doubt have continued with us'—but the Lord permits these things, by reason that our own free-will subsists, in order that whilst the test of truth is applied to our minds, the sound faith of such as are approved may be made manifest."[3] Much more I could add to our purpose from this same Father; but let this suffice.

§ 2.

On the Degree of the Corruption of Human Nature.

Such emphatic enunciation of the freedom of the will is in itself enough to prove that the early Fathers did not hold the *total corruption* of human nature, in the Calvinistic sense, as the result of the Fall. Other arguments, however, to the same effect, are not wanting; though it is to be observed that nothing can be less systematic or less organized than their notions on this subject: I might say, often even contradictory; such inconsistency partly, perhaps, arising from the point never having been canvassed by men with any care, as

[1] De Principiis, III. c. i. §§ 6, 7. Origen has also a dissertation on the freedom of the will in his commentary on Gen. i. 14.

[2] Cyprian, Ep. lv. § 7.

[3] De Unitate Ecclesiæ, §§ ix. x.

it eventually was by controversialists of a later day—a remark which applies to many other theological topics as handled by the Fathers—and partly from the embarrassment of their position; for whilst Scripture and self-experience compelled them to admit the grievous corruption of our nature, they had perpetually to contend against a powerful body of heretics who made such corruption the ground for affirming that a world so evil could not have been created by a good God, but was the work of a Demiurgus. The embarrassment itself, and the nature of it, is very perceptible in Tertullian's treatise against Marcion; the Marcionites disparaging the creation, which Tertullian undertakes to defend[1]; as well as in several passages of the Stromata of Clemens.[2]

Accordingly Barnabas represents the heart of the natural man as "a house of devils"[3]; but then he also represents the natural man as being still "the image of God."[4]

Tatian considers the soul to have been created of two principles; the one called ψυχὴ, which was material, being a portion of the material substance which pervaded the universe[5]; the other not material, called "the image and likeness of God,"[6] the "holy spirit,"[7] the "perfect spirit."[8] He maintains that man, by the abuse of his free-will (for with freedom of will he was created[9]) *lost* this latter spirit[10]; or retained *only as it were a spark of it*[11]: that his soul consequently became mortal through privation of the spirit; that hence it gravitates downwards towards matter, itself material; dies, and is dissolved with the body, but will rise again at the end of the world and receive punishment eternal[12]; that this natural tendency of the deserted soul downwards is aggravated by matter which seeks to subdue it to itself, and by demons who would willingly prevent its ever rising towards heaven again; nevertheless, that man *has it in his power to recover the spirit*, to unite the soul with it again; when, if the body

[1] See especially Adversus Marcionem, I. c. xiv. Postremo te tibi circumfer, intus ac foris considera hominem, etc.

[2] See Clem. Alex. Stromat. IV. § vii. p. 584. Ἵνα μὴ ὡς Μαρκίων ἀχαρίστως ἐκδέξηταί τις τὴν δημιουργίαν κακήν. And IV. § xiii. p. 605. Τὸ δὲ ἀγαπᾶν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς, οὐκ ἀγαπᾶν τὸ κακὸν λέγει. And V. § xiv. p. 731. Αἰτία ἑλομένου· Θεὸς ἀναίτιος.

[3] Barnabas, § xvi.

[4] § xx.

[5] Tatian, Oratio contra Græcos, § 12.

[6] Ibid. [7] § 15. [8] § 20.

[9] §§ 7, 11.

[10] Ἀπολωλέκαμεν.—§ 15.

[11] Ὥσπερ ἔνανσμα τῆς δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.—§ 13.

[12] §§ 13, 17.

be kept clean, the spirit will dwell in it, as in a temple; that it is open to all thus to recover this spirit; and to revert to man's ancient estate.[1]

Athenagoras gives token, whenever his argument leads him to touch on the question, that his ideas of the corruption of our nature are anything but those of Calvin—indeed are very unsettled, very imperfect. Thus in one place he says, that man, "according to the determination of his own reason, and the operation of the *ruler who has obtained dominion over him*, and of the attendant demons, is carried in different directions, though the power of reasoning is common to all."[2] When it is considered that by this ruler, who had obtained dominion over man, Athenagoras meant (as he defines him elsewhere[3]) the spirit who is opposed to God and his good designs, we must regard him as having here in contemplation the Fall and its fatal effects. Nevertheless, he elsewhere contends, that man not being called into existence for a time, but for eternity, must accordingly have his nature permanently secured; his nature, which consists of body as well as soul; the two together forming *man;* in this respect distinguished from animals, as he is distinguished from them "by bearing in himself the image of his Maker; by being endued with understanding, and by partaking of reason and judgment."[4] And again, that "if the understanding and reason are given to man for the discernment, not of substances merely, but of ideas too; of the goodness, for instance, the wisdom, the justice of the Giver; it follows that whilst those objects remain, on account of which the rational faculty of discrimination was given, the faculty itself, so given, will remain. But this cannot remain, unless the nature which is its receptacle remain; but the receptacle of the mind is the man; therefore the man must remain, compounded as he is of both parts; but that cannot be without a resurrection."[5] The reasoning evidently turns on the presumption that certain moral perceptions are to be found in the souls of all mankind; or, in other

[1] Tatian, Oratio Contra Græcos, §§ 15, 16, 11, 20.

[2] Κατὰ δὲ τὸν ἴδιον ἑαυτοῦ λόγον καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐπέχοντος ἄρχυντος, καὶ τῶν παρακολουθούντων δαιμόνων ἐνεργείαν ἄλλος ἄλλως φέρεται καὶ κινεῖται — Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, § 25.

[3] Ibid. See also Bishop Kaye's Justin Martyr, p. 105.

[4] Athenagoras, De Mortuorum Resurrectione, § 12.

[5] § 15.

words, that the corruption of our nature is not total. Indeed, in one passage, written however probably without much thought, he seems to overlook original in actual sin; and asserts that infants will not be brought to judgment, seeing that they have done neither good nor evil.[1]

Theophilus describes the Fall as causing "blindness of soul and hardness of heart in man;"[2] and postpones the conception of Cain to a period later than that event[3]: yet he teaches that every one who pleases (ὁ βουλόμενος) may attain everlasting life[4]: and tells Autolycus, that, if he wishes it, he may be healed.[5]

Irenæus speaks repeatedly of the image and likeness of God having been "lost" at the Fall[6]; "cast away;"[7] of the Fall having "alienated" us from God[8]; of man being "vanquished and demolished" by the Fall[9]; of the recovery from the Fall being altogether owing to God, "man having by his own nature nothing incorruptible about him, no natural similitude to God."[10] And yet elsewhere we find him extenuating the disastrous effects of the Fall; quoting with approbation, for instance, against Tatian and those who maintained that Adam perished for his sin, even in spite of the advent of Christ, the remark of an ancient writer, that God devolved the curse upon the ground in order that it might not rest on man; and adding that Adam and Eve had their troubles in the toil to which the one, the pains of childbirth to which the other was subjected, and in the death which was awarded to them both, but that the weight of the curse fell on the serpent; that Adam was still in a condition to feel at once strong compunction for his sin; become

[1] Εἰ γὰρ μόνον τὸ κατὰ τὴν κρίσιν δίκαιον τῆς ἀναστάσεως ἦν αἴτιον, ἐχρῆν δήπου τοὺς μηδὲν ἡμαρτηκότας, ἢ κατορθώσαντας, μηδ' ἀνίστασθαι, τουτέστι τοὺς κομιδῇ νέους παῖδας. Ἐξὸν δὲ πάντας ἀνίστασθαι, τούς τε ἄλλους, καὶ δὴ καὶ τοὺς κατὰ τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν τελευτήσαντας.—Athenagoras, De Mortuorum Resurrectione, § 14.

[2] Theophilus, Ad Autolycum, I. § 7.

[3] II. § 28.

[4] II. § 27.

[5] I. § 7.

[6] Ut quod perdideramus in Adam, id est, secundum imaginem et similitudinem esse Dei, hoc in Christo Jesu reciperemus.—Irenæus, III. c. xviii. § 1.

[7] Διὰ τοῦτο δὴ καὶ τὴν ὁμοίωσιν ῥᾳδίως ἀπέβαλεν.—V. c. xvi. § 2.

[8] Et quoniam injuste dominabatur nobis apostasia, et quum naturâ essemus Dei omnipotentis, *alienavit* nos contra naturam.—V. c. i. § 1.

[9] Victus et elisus per inobedientiam. —III. c. xviii. § 2.

[10] Nec unquam de Deo contrarium sensum accipiat homo, propriam naturaliter arbitrans eam, quæ circa se esset, incorruptelam, et non tenens veritatem, inani supercilio jactaretur, quasi naturaliter similis esset Deo.—III. c. xx. § 1.

penitent; submit himself to sharp penance; and so to obtain mercy.[1] In the same spirit we perceive him on another occasion applying the language of St. Paul in the seventh chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, descriptive of the struggle between the will and the conscience, apparently to the natural or unregenerate man, as though there were virtue enough left in him, even since the Fall, to be productive of this conflict.[2] And again, when speaking of the mysteries which mankind must expect to encounter in the Scriptures from their incapacity to fathom writings dictated by the Word of God and his Spirit, his phrase is, "inasmuch as we are defective and *very far removed* from the Word of God and his Spirit"[3]—an obscure sentence certainly in the Latin, and the Greek is lost, but still not calculated to convey the extremest notions of the amount of damage caused by the Fall.

If we turn to Tertullian, we shall discover him evidently recognising on the whole the evil consequences of the Fall, but not in a manner satisfactory to the Calvinist—indeed, his trumpet, like that of the other Fathers, giving an uncertain sound. On the one hand he tells us that man had "departed" from a good God[4]: that man was at first circumvented by Satan, "the corrupter of the whole world; so that he transgressed the command of God, and was therefore consigned to death; and thence made the whole human race, now contaminated by being sprung from his seed, partakers also of that condemnation which befell him;"[5] as offsets are partakers of the properties of the stock—it is not easy for words to convey a more ample acknowledgment of original or birth-sin than this, or one more thoroughly Anti-Pelagian—that at the Fall man was lost wholly and not merely in part, "since the transgression which was the cause of his being lost was committed both by a desire of the mind and by an act of the flesh, and so made the *whole* man fully deserve per-

[1] Irenæus, III. c. xxiii. §§ 3, 4, 5.

[2] III. c. xx. § 3.

[3] Nos autem secundum quod minores sumus et novissimi a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus, secundum hoc et scientiâ mysteriorum ejus indigemus.—II. c. xxviii. § 2.

[4] Ideo malum hominem, quia a Deo bono abscesserit.—Tertullian, De Testimonio Animæ, c. ii.

[5] Quem (sc. Satanam) nos dicimus malitiæ angelum, totius erroris artificem, totius sæculi interpolatorem, per quem homo a primordio circumventus, ut præceptum Dei excederet, et propterea in mortem datus, exinde totum genus de suo semine infectum, suæ etiam damnationis traducem fecit.—c. iii.

dition,"[1]—the latter clause serving to explain the sense in which *wholly* is to be here understood; namely, that the Fall affected both the soul and body of man—that the enemy of God, the destroyer, "when he succeeded in casting man down from his innocence at first, the image and workmanship of God as he was, and the possessor of the universe, *changed also his entire substance*, which was created pure as his own, into perverseness against his Maker, like his own:"[2] that "man departed from his Maker both in body and soul:"[3] that "the devil transfigured the spirit of man by his malice:"[4] that we cannot safely take nature for our guide, seeing that "the devil has corrupted the whole creation which ministers to man's use, together with *man himself*; for the Apostle speaks of the creation as made subject unto vanity:" that "accordingly touching spectacles, the world is abused by those who maintain that all the component parts of these spectacles are of God; forgetting all the while that all things have been changed by the devil:"[5] that "man had been innocent, the close friend of God, the inhabitant of paradise; but that when he once gave way to impatience" (this passage occurs in the tract "De Patientiâ") "he ceased to be wise unto God; he ceased to be able to sustain heavenly things; henceforth man was given to the earth, an outcast from the sight of God;

[1] Imprimis, cum ad hoc venisse se dicit, uti quod periit, salvum faciat, quid dicas perisse? Hominem sine dubio. Totumne, an ex parte? Utique totum: siquidem transgressio, quæ perditionis humanæ causa est, tam animæ instinctu ex concupiscentiâ, quam et carnis actu ex degustatione commissa, totum hominem elogio transgressionis inscripsit, atque exinde merito perditionis implevit.—De Resurrectione Carnis, c. xxxiv.

[2] Nos igitur qui, Domino cognito, etiam æmulum ejus inspicimus, qui, institutore comperto, etiam interpolatorem unâ deprehendimus, neque mirari, neque dubitare oportet, quum ipsum hominem, opus et imaginem Dei, totius universitatis possessorem, illa vis interpolatoris et æmulatoris angeli ab initio de integritate dejecerit, universam substantiam ejus pariter cum ipso integritati institutam, pariter cum ipso in perversitatem demutarit adversus institutorem.—De Spectaculis, c. ii.

[3] Ipse homo omnium flagitiorum auctor, non tantum opus Dei, verum etiam imago est, et tamen et corpore et spiritu descivit a suo institutore.—Ibid.

[4] Is est diabolus. Nam quis corpus mutare monstraret, nisi qui et hominis spiritum malitiâ transfiguravit?—De Cultu Fœminarum, II. c. v.

[5] Quæris an conditioni ejus fruendæ natura nobis debeat præire, ne illâ rapiamur quâ Dei æmulus universam conditionem certis usibus homini mancipatam, cum ipso homine corrupit, unde eam et apostolus invitam ait vanitati succidisse, vanis primum usibus, tam turpibus, et injustis, et impiis, subversam? Sic itaque et circa voluptates spectaculorum infamata conditio est ab eis qui naturâ quidem, Dei omnia sentiunt, ex quibus spectacula instruuntur; scientiâ autem deficiunt illud quoque intelligere, omnia esse a diabolo mutata.—De Coronâ, c. vi.

and began to be made subservient, through impatience, to whatever would offend God:"[1] that the image and likeness of God was taken away at the Fall by the devil[2]; was ruined[3]; was destroyed[4]; was lost by sin[5]; was stolen by the serpent.[6] And yet, on the other hand, this same Tertullian writes, "Render therefore unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's; that is, Cæsar's image, which was on the money, to Cæsar; God's image, which is in man, to God."[7] Again, after man had been driven out of Paradise, "God," says he, "made a covenant to pardon his handiwork, his image."[8] Again, the treatise "De Animâ" clearly recognises the existence of virtue, more or less, in the natural man. Tertullian is here disposed to admit Plato's division of the substance of the soul into the rational and the irrational, though not to assign both parts to it in its original creation: maintaining that, rational in its first constitution, the irrational portion was added to it at the Fall, and coalesced with it as completely as if it had belonged to it from the beginning[9]; that, since the Fall, it has ever been brought into existence of this mixed character; and being besides waylaid at its birth by the evil spirit, sustains further damage in that shape[10]; nevertheless, that there is virtue in it still; what came from God not so much extinguished as overshadowed; the worst soul having in it some good, the best some evil; that it is the remains of its primitive nature, which prompts it to bear witness of God by sudden and involuntary exclamations, such as "God is good;" "God sees;" "I commend it unto God;"[11] that hence even heathen philosophy

[1] Innocens erat, et Deo de proximo amicus, et Paradisi colonus. At ubi semel succidit impatientiæ desivit Deo sapere, desivit cœlestia sustinere posse. Exinde homo terræ datus, et ab oculis Dei ejectus, facile usurpari ab impatientiâ cœpit in omne quod Deum offenderet.—De Patientiâ, c. v.

[2] A diabolo captam.—De Carne Christi, c. xvii.

[3] Tu imaginem Dei, hominum, tam facile elisisti.—De Cultu Fœminarum, I. c. i.

[4] Abierat in perditionem.—De Carne Christi, c. xvii.

[5] Recipit enim illum Dei spiritum, quem tunc de afflatu ejus acceperat, sed post amiserat per delictum.—De Baptismo, c. v.

[6] Ille (sc. serpens) a primordio divinæ imaginis prædo.—Adversus Valentinianos, c. ii.

[7] Reddite, ait, quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari, et quæ sunt Dei, Deo; id est imaginem Cæsaris Cæsari, quæ in nummo est, et imaginem Dei Deo, quæ in homine est.—De Idololatriâ, c. xv.

[8] Rescissâ sententiâ irarum pristinarum, ignoscere pactus operi et imagini suæ.—De Pœnitentiâ, c. ii.

[9] De Animâ, c. xvi.

[10] cc. xxxix. xli.

[11] Quod enim a Deo est, non tam extinguitur, quam obumbratur. Potest

presents sometimes elements of the true faith.[1] Much of this argument for the qualified corruption of the soul in its natural state is repeated in other of Tertullian's treatises; in the "De Resurrectione Carnis;"[2] in the "De Testimonio Animæ;"[3] in the tract against Marcion[4]; and in the "Apology;"[5] with references to which I shall content myself. But there is one passage more on the same side, to which I cannot help adverting more explicitly, because its inconsistency with so many other places in Tertullian, several of which I have already adduced, is flagrant. It occurs in his tract "De Baptismo,"[6] where he recommends delay in administering that Sacrament, in the case of children especially, and adds, "Why should an innocent age (*i. e.* infancy) be in haste for the remission of sins?" as though he had entirely forgotten that there was such a thing as original sin—he, the same Tertullian, who had elsewhere urged our Lord's declaration, that "'unless a man is born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,' *i. e.* cannot be holy; every soul being numbered in Adam, until it is numbered anew in Christ, and filthy until it is thus numbered anew."[7] It has been supposed with some probability that Tertullian might be here influenced by a strong feeling of the moment as to the irremissible nature of heinous sins committed after Baptism; and so overlooked the alternative which he had elsewhere so fully admitted, that provision has to be made for the remission of original sin, in contemplation of early death.[8] But, however that may be, it is evident that Tertullian's views were not, on the whole, Calvinistic.

Clemens Alexandrinus stands in nearly the same position as those before him with regard to this question; recognising the Fall, and the corruption of our nature which ensued from it; but in no such manner as to satisfy the Calvinists; expressing himself elsewhere in terms which necessarily qualify any conclusion which they could draw from detached pas-

enim obumbrari, quia non est Deus; extingui non potest, quia a Deo est . . . . Sic et divinitas animæ in præsagia erumpit, ex bono priore, et conscientiâ Dei in testimonium prodit: Deus bonus! Deus videt, et Deo commendo.—c. xli.

[1] c. ii.

[2] De Resurrectione Carnis, c. iii.

[3] De Testimonio Animæ, cc. ii. iii. iv. v.

[4] Adversus Marcionem, I. c. x.

[5] Apol. c. xvii.

[6] De Baptismo, c. xviii.

[7] De Animâ, cc. xxxix. xl.

[8] See Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, pp. 422, 423. 3rd Ed.

sages; and on the whole, giving evidence, perhaps, more than any previous Father, that the question itself, destined to be such a crux for future polemics, had not yet been technically determined, or even carefully examined; very far from it. Thus he quotes and adopts the expression of Barnabas, that before conversion to the faith, the heart is "a house of devils, wherein everything is done that is opposed to God."[1] He affirms that we are "*not by nature* the children of God; so that it is the chief proof of all the goodness of God, that whilst we behave ourselves towards him as we do, and are *by nature utterly estranged* from him, he cares for us:"[2] that the language of Christ to man is this, "born as thou unhappily wast *unto death* through the world, I gave thee a new birth, set thee free, healed, ransomed thee, will show thee the face of thy good Father; let the *dead* bury their dead, follow thou me:"[3] that "we are by nature fitted for virtue, *not indeed so as to have it from our birth*, but so as to be fitted for acquiring it:"[4] that "the Advent of the Saviour was necessary in order that our nature might be able to *shine again*:"[5] that "none but the Word is without sin; for that *to sin is planted in all, and common to all*; but to recover after sin is not the act of an ordinary, but of an extraordinary man."[6] On the other hand, when animadverting on the heretics who applied texts of Scripture to the disparagement of marriage, this amongst the number, "No one is clean from defilement," says Job, "even though his life be but one day,"[7] he observes, "let them tell us where it was that the new-born child committed fornication? or how that which had done nothing, fell under *the curse of Adam?* It rests with them, as it should seem, in order to make their assertion logical, (to

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. II. § xx. p. 490.

[2] Κήδεται ἡμῶν, μήτε μορίων ὄντων αὐτοῦ, μήτε φύσει τέκνων. Καὶ δὴ ἡ μεγίστη τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀγαθότητος ἔνδειξις αὕτη τυγχάνει· ὅτι οὕτως ἐχόντων ἡμῶν πρὸς αὐτὸν, καὶ φύσει ἀπηλλοτριωμένων παντελῶς, ὅμως κήδεται.—§ xvi. p. 468.

The Fall is not here directly referred to, and the reasoning might be at first supposed to turn on the mere dissimilarity which subsisted between the essence of God and of man. Yet the context contemplates the sin of man as entering into that difference.

[3] Ἐγώ σε ἀνεγέννησα, κακῶς ὑπὸ κόσμου πρὸς θάνατον γεγεννημένον, κ.τ.λ.—Clem. Alex. Quis dives salvetur, § xxiii. p. 948.

[4] Φύσει μὲν ἐπιτήδειοι γεγόναμεν πρὸς ἀρετὴν· οὐ μὴν ὥστε ἔχειν αὐτὴν ἐκ γενετῆς, ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸ κτήσασθαι ἐπιτήδειοι.—Stromat. VI. § xi. p. 788.

[5] Stromat. V. § i. p. 645.

[6] Pædag. III. c. xii. p. 307.

[7] Job xiv. 4, 5. LXX.

prove) that generation, not of the body only, but of the soul too, is an evil."[1] And then he proceeds to argue, "And when David says, 'in sin did my mother conceive me,' he considered *Eve his mother by anticipation.* Yet Eve was the mother of all *living;* and though he was conceived in sin, he was not in sin himself, nor was he himself sin."[2] Nothing can be more perplexed than the reasoning in this passage, or indicate greater vacillation on the question of original sin; carping, as it does, at an opinion of Basilides, elsewhere more distinctly expressed,[3] which affirmed that doctrine—affirmed it, no doubt, for heretical purposes of his own—and yet admitting it in the case of David, by explaining his confession as relating to the debasement occasioned to her race by the lapse of Eve; and again qualifying this concession by the supposition that still Eve was the mother of all *living.* On the whole, we have here a very notable example of that embarrassment felt by the Fathers when dealing with this question, that arose, as I have said, out of a fear of giving an advantage to the heretics; and which certainly is the key to most of their inconsistencies upon it. Again, when tracing the origin of idolatry, Clemens tells of "a certain *primitive communion* with heaven planted in man, darkened, indeed, by ignorance, but suddenly in some way creeping forth from the darkness, and again shining out."[4] Once more, denouncing the lustful appetites which the heathen cherished in themselves by the emblems of their gods, he exclaims, "O what violence ye do to man! even offering up to reproach *whatever there is of divine* in the creature."[5] Again, "man is an animal that loves God."[6] Again, "man is by nature a high and lofty animal that seeks after what is good, as being the workmanship of the One."[7] Again, "God hath made us *by nature social and just;* so that justice must not be said to come of

[1] Λεγέτωσαν ἡμῖν, ποῦ ἐπόρνευσεν τὸ γεννηθὲν παιδίον; ἢ πῶς ὑπὸ τὴν τοῦ Ἀδὰμ ὑποπέπτωκεν ἁρὰν τὸ μηθὲν ἐνεργῆσαν; κ.τ.λ.—Clem. Alex. Stromat. III. § xvi. p. 556.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Stromat. IV. § xii. p. 600.

[4] Ἦν δέ τις ἔμφυτος ἀρχαία πρὸς οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώποις κοινωνία, ἀγνοίᾳ μὲν ἐσκοτισμένη, ἄφνω δέ που διεκθρώσκουσα τοῦ σκότους, καὶ ἀναλάμπουσα.—Cohortatio ad Gentes, § ii. p. 21.

[5] Ὦ βιασάμενοι τὸν ἄνθρωπον· καὶ τὸ ἔνθεον τοῦ πλάσματος ἐλέγχει ἀπάρξαντες.—§ iv. p. 53.

[6] Τὸ κάλλιστον τῶν ὑπ' αὐτοῦ δημιουργηθέντων, καὶ φιλόθεον ζῶον.—Pædag. I. c. viii. p. 135.

[7] Φύσει γὰρ ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὑψηλόν ἐστι ζῶον καὶ γαῦρον, καὶ τοῦ καλοῦ ζητητικὸν, ἅτε τοῦ Μόνου δημιούργημα.—III. c. vii. p. 276.

position" (to be the creature of circumstances), "but must rather be considered the good which belonged to our original creation, quickened by precept; the soul trained by education to a desire of choosing the best."[1]

Turn we next to Cyprian. He speaks of the Divine image having been *lost* by the Fall.[2] And after remarking on the death of the combatants in the arena being sometimes demanded as a gratification to the spectators, he ejaculates, "as though man's own nature were not cruel enough, and had to be taught brutality in public."[3] Yet he elsewhere contents himself with such moderate estimate of man's corruption as the following, "the mind of man is itself *prone* to vice, what then will it do if it have the example before it? If the nature of the body be so unsteady as to fall of its own accord, what will it do if it is impelled?"[4]

The language of Origen on this subject is of the same conflicting character, but still on the whole clearly opposed to that of Calvin. Thus, in his treatise against Celsus, "Celsus," says he, "has not shown how transgression is connected *with our very generation*: nor has he pointed out what he wishes himself, and so given us an opportunity of comparing his system with ours. Whereas the prophets intimating that view of the circumstances even of our generation which is the wise one, say that sacrifice is offered for sin, even the *sin of those just born*, as though *even then they were not free from sin*: for it is written, 'I was shapen in wickedness, and in sin did my mother conceive me:' and again, as sinners they were 'estranged even from their mother's womb;' so extraordinary an expression used as this, 'they go astray from the womb, they speak lies.'"[5] Again, in the same, "Celsus

[1] *Φύσει δ' αὖ κοινωνικοὺς καὶ δικαίους ὁ Θεὸς ἡμᾶς ἐδημιούργησεν, ὅθεν οὐδὲ τὸ δίκαιον ἐκ μόνης φαίνεσθαι τῆς θέσεως ῥητέον ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐντολῆς ἀναζωπυρεῖσθαι τὸ τῆς δημιουργίας ἀγαθὸν νοητέον, μαθήσει παιδευθείσης τῆς ψυχῆς ἐθέλειν αἱρεῖσθαι τὸ κάλλιστον.*—Stromat. I. § vi. p. 336.

[2] Si similitudo divina, quam peccato Adam perdiderat, manifestetur.—Cyprian, De Bono Patientiæ, § v.

[3] Inter voluptates spectantium quorumdam mors erogatur, ut per cruentum spectaculum sævire discatur, quasi parum sit homini privata sua rabies, nisi illam et publice discat.—De Spectaculis, § v.

[4] Nam," cum mens hominis ad vitia ipsa ducatur, quid faciet, si habuerit exempla? natura corporis caduca, quæ sponte corruit, quid faciet, si fuerit impulsa? reading natura instead of naturæ. —§ viii.

[5] *Ὁ μὲν οὖν οὐκ ἐσαφήνισε πῶς μετὰ γενέσεώς ἐστι πλάνη· οὐδὲ παρέστησεν ὅ, τι περ ἐβούλετο· ἵνα κατανοήσωμεν συγκρίνοντες τὰ αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἡμετέροις. Οἱ δὲ προφῆται αἰνιττόμενοι ὅ, τι περὶ τῶν γενέσεως*

mischievously represents us as saying, that God will receive the unrighteous man, if he humble himself under his iniquity; but that he will not receive the righteous man if he should virtuously look up to him from the very first. Whereas we say that it is impossible *for man to look up to God virtuously from the very first;* for that wickedness must needs be in man at the first."[1] Again, "Celsus often scoffs at the resurrection which he does not comprehend; but not content with that, he says that we talk of a resurrection of the flesh from the tree; misunderstanding, I presume, what is spoken figuratively, that as *by the tree came death,* so did life come by the tree—death in Adam—life in Christ:"[2] the effect of the Fall balanced by the effect of the Passion: the effect of the latter event, therefore, being the recovery of man, the effect of the former must be here represented to be his ruin. But indeed there is no need to establish this conclusion by inference; since, in another place, where Origen is meeting an objection made by Celsus against the Mosaic account of the creation—that Moses exhibits God so powerless as to have been unable to secure the obedience even of a single man whom he had himself created—he replies that "in the Hebrew Adam means man; and that Moses, when he speaks of Adam, speaks, in fact, of the nature of man; inasmuch as all died in Adam, and were condemned under the similitude of Adam's transgression; and that accordingly Scripture, in relating this event, does not so much speak of the individual as of the whole species; for that the curse of Adam, which in the history is described as that of an individual, is, in fact, common to all mankind."[3] Yet this same Origen writes, "Man loves life, having a persuasion that *the rational soul has something in its essence akin to God.* For both are intellectual and invisible; and as reason irresistibly shows, incorporeal. And why did he who fashioned us, put into us a desire of piety and of communion with him; a desire which

πραγμάτων σοφὸν, θυσίαν περὶ ἁμαρτίας λέγουσιν ἀναφέρεσθαι, καὶ περὶ τῶν ἄρτι γεγεννημένων, ὡς οὐ καθαρῶν ἀπὸ ἁμαρτίας. Φασὶ δὲ καὶ τὸ, ἐν ἀνομίαις συνελήφθην, καὶ ἐν ἁμαρτίαις ἐκίσησέ με ἡ μήτηρ μου. Ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀποφαίνονται ὅτι ἀπηλλοτριώθησαν οἱ ἁμαρτωλοὶ ἀπὸ μήτρας, παραδόξως λέγοντες καὶ τὸ, ἐπλανήθησαν ἀπὸ γαστρὸς, ἐλάλησαν ψευδῆ. — Origen, Contra Celsum, VII. § 50.

[1] Ἀδύνατον γάρ φαμεν εἶναι ἄνθρωπον μετ' ἀρετῆς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ἄνω βλέπειν. Κακίαν γὰρ ὑφίστασθαι ἀναγκαῖον πρῶτον ἐν ἀνθρώποις.—III. § 62.

[2] VI. § 36. [3] IV. § 40.

even in those who have gone astray, *preserves some traces of the Divine will;* if it was not possible for beings thus rational to attain unto that which they *naturally* desire?"[1] Again, the following passage, like the last, seems to recognise some remains of the original character of man as having survived the Fall. "But if any one dares assign essential corruption to a being who was made in the image and likeness of God, in my opinion he includes in this impious charge, even the Son of God himself; for he, too, is called in Scripture the image of God. At least, let him who entertains this opinion, question the authority of Scripture, which says that man was made in the image of God—man, in whom *indications of the Divine image are clearly discovered,* not by the figure of the body which is corrupted, but by prudence of mind, by justice, by moderation, by virtue, by wisdom, by discipline, by a whole company, in short, of virtues, which, existing essentially in God, may exist also in man by industry and imitation of God."[2]

But in order to prevent mistakes, and the imputation of mere Pelagianism to the Fathers, a charge which has sometimes been made against them by partial and desultory readers, I shall suspend, for a moment, the prosecution of the subject immediately before us, to remark that peremptory as we see the Fathers are on the question of free-will, and far as they are from giving countenance to the sentiments of Calvin on that of human corruption, they still entertain such a sense of the effects of the Fall on the soul of man, as to teach the absolute necessity of the active influence of the Holy Spirit upon it, for its recovery and restoration. At the same time they regard that influence as a persuasive, not a compulsive principle; a fact determined both by their doctrine of the freedom of the will, and by express assertions to that purpose; a reference to some of which, in due season, will again bring us back to the topic I am pursuing. There is, indeed, no absolute call to produce an array of testimonies

[1] Ἔτι δὲ καὶ φιλοζωεῖ ἄνθρωπος, πεῖσμα λαβὼν περὶ οὐσίας λογικῆς ψυχῆς, ὡς ἐχούσης τι συγγενὲς Θεῷ. Νοερὰ γὰρ ἑκάτερα καὶ ἀόρατα· καὶ ὡς ὁ ἐπικρατῶν ἀποδείκνυσι λόγος, ἀσώματα. Τί δὲ καὶ ὁ κατασκευάζων ἡμᾶς ἐνεποίει πόθον τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν εὐσεβείας καὶ κοινωνίας, ὅς τις καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἐσφαλμένοις ἴχνη τινὰ σώζει τοῦ θείου βουλεύματος, εἴπερ μὴ ἦν δυνατὸν τὸ φυσικῶς ποθούμενον τοῖς λογικοῖς καταλαβεῖν;—Exhortatio ad Martyrium, § 47.

[2] De Principiis, IV. § 37.

from the Fathers, in order to prove that they believed in the doctrine of grace, and in the necessity fallen man is under of seeking its aid. The single fact of their holding that of regeneration in Baptism, as we have found them doing, and yet admitting Infant-Baptism, being enough in itself to establish the other conclusion. For where was the need to be "born again" (a very strong expression), even where no actual sin had been committed by the parties, unless there was understood to be very gross evil in the first birth? And how could a spiritual evil, as this must be, have been supposed to find a remedy, except in a spiritual agency?—the Fathers themselves perfectly alive to this inference, as is evident from a remarkable passage in Tertullian already cited.[1] Waiving, however, this argument, I will proceed to prove my point by other evidence in detail.

Thus Barnabas, having described the way of good, and the way of evil, of light and of darkness, goes on to apprize him who would walk in the better path, that "he must be simple in heart, and must *abound in the Spirit* . . . . that he must not rule his servants with austerity, seeing that both he and they hope in the same God, who came not to call them with respect to persons, but even as the Spirit had prepared them."[2]

Hermas advises to test those who profess to be in possession of the Holy Spirit by their life and works[3]; as though our virtues were to be ascribed to the presence of that Holy Spirit within us.

Clemens Romanus, though announcing no formal opinion on the subject, uses language which shows plainly enough, that the doctrine of spiritual influence was familiar to his mind. As thus, "Let us cleave to those to whom grace has been given by God."[4] And in a prayer at the close of his epistle he says, "The all-seeing God, and Master of spirits, and Lord of all flesh, who hath chosen the Lord Jesus Christ and us through him for a peculiar people, grant to every soul that calls upon his great and holy Name, faith, fear, peace, patience, long-suffering, continence, chastity, temperance, that they may be acceptable in his sight, through our High Priest and Advo-

[1] Tertullian, De Animâ, c. xli.
[2] Barnabas, § xix.
[3] Hermas, II. Mandatum xi.
[4] Clem. Rom. Ad Corinthios, I. § xxx.

cate Jesus Christ,"[1] as though the graces here enumerated were not of ourselves, but of God.

I will content myself with one passage from Ignatius, but that a most remarkable one; for though expressing the doctrine we are investigating under a figure the most homely and mechanical, it is undeniable as to its meaning. He is commending the Ephesians for not having allowed themselves to be led astray by certain false teachers who had been among them. Against these, says he, "Ye stopped your ears, so as not to entertain the mischievous seed they scattered about; feeling yourselves to be stones of the temple of the Father, prepared for the building of God the Father, drawn up aloft by the engine of Jesus Christ, even the cross, *using the Holy Spirit for your rope*, your faith the pulley."[2]

Justin Martyr recognises the doctrine in various places. Thus, in his "Cohortatio ad Græcos," when tracing many of Plato's statements to his knowledge of Revelation, he represents those on virtue as derived from what he had read in the prophets respecting the Spirit. "For fearing to call this gift of God the Holy Ghost, lest by following the doctrine of the prophets he should seem to be an enemy to the Greeks, he confesses, indeed, that it comes down from above from God, but thinks it best to call it virtue, and not the Holy Ghost. For in his dialogue with Meno on the subject of memory, after many preliminary inquiries concerning virtue, whether it could be acquired by instruction, or by use, or by neither, but came to men by nature, or by some other means, he expresses himself in the following terms. 'If, then, in the course of this dissertation we have conducted our investigation well, and worded it rightly, virtue would appear to come neither by nature, nor by instruction; but to present itself to those who enjoy it, by a Divine allotment independent of the understanding.'"[3] Whatever we may think of Justin's notion,

[1] Clem. Rom. Ad Corinthios, I. § lviii.

[2] Ignatius, Ad Ephesios, § ix.

[3] Justin Martyr, Cohortatio ad Græcos, § 32. Bishop Kaye doubts the genuineness of this work, pointing out several passages in it which present discrepancies when compared with other works of Justin, of which the authority is above suspicion. But would such discrepancies be found greater than those which exist amongst his several genuine writings? Compare *e. g.* the prophecy of Gen. xlix. 10, as given in Apol. I. § 32, and in Dial. § 52; or Psalm cx. 1–3, as quoted in Dial. § 32, and in § 83. And is close consistency to be expected in a writer exhibiting such marks of carelessness, or possibly want of leisure, opportunity, or books (for the times in which he lived were troubled) as Justin?

that Plato gained his idea of virtue from the prophetical descriptions of the Holy Ghost, this at least must be admitted, that the argument proves Justin himself to have had no doubt about the active energies of the Holy Ghost among men. This, however, further appears from other passages in Justin's works: as, that the grace of God is necessary to make us fully understand the words and deeds of the prophets [1]; that he was himself indebted to it for whatever sound knowledge of the Scriptures he possessed [2]; that we should pray, above all things, to have the gates of light opened to us, for that (the truth) is not to be perceived or comprehended by any, save by those to whom God and his Christ gave the faculty of perceiving and comprehending it [3]: that it is by the help of those gifts which Christ promised he would send to mankind after his ascension, that he (Justin) hopes to convince Trypho.[4]

Tatian's sentiments on this subject, so far as they are intelligible, were involved in his notions of the corruption of our nature, and have already been noticed; the sum of them being, that the Holy Ghost which was lost at the Fall, and which constituted the soul's life, must be recovered before the soul can rise again to its lofty estate, and find its wings.[5]

Athenagoras, in his short works, does not happen to have occasion to speak of the ordinary effects of the Spirit, but he is so explicit on the extraordinary, that we cannot doubt he held both; representing the Holy Ghost to breathe into the prophets, as a piper into his reed.[6]

Theophilus attributes his own conversion to the prophetical Scriptures,[7] which the Holy Ghost dictated through their authors.[8] He prays God to give him *grace* to declare the truth; and to Autolycus (to whom he writes) and his other readers, *grace* to receive and follow it [9]; and he speaks of the Christian being one whom *grace* preserves.[10]

As we proceed, we discover the Fathers to become more

See *e. g.* his errors of chronology, Apol. I. § 31; his misquotation of names, Apol. I. § 51; Dial. § 12; his mistakes about historical facts, Dial. § 86; not to speak of the indications he affords of having forgotten in one place what he had said in another.

[1] Dial. § 92. [2] §§ 58. 119. [3] § 7. [4] § 39.

[5] Tatian, Oratio contra Græcos, §§ 13. 15. 20.

[6] Athenagoras, Legatio pro Christianis, §§ 9, 10.

[7] Theophilus, Ad Autolycum, I. § 14.

[8] II. § 9. [9] III. § 23.

[10] III. § 15.

and more copious on this great article of faith; insomuch that it is even difficult to compress their declarations of it within any reasonable compass. Such is the case with Irenæus. He makes frequent confession of it whenever he is invited to do so by the course of his argument. The seventeenth chapter of his third book is almost entirely occupied with it. The Gnostics, by understanding the descent of the Holy Ghost upon Jesus at his baptism, as recorded in the Gospel, to be that of their Æon Christ, upon the man Jesus, had virtually excluded the Holy Ghost from their system[1]; a defect in it of which Irenæus proceeds to point out the magnitude, and in so doing necessarily is led to describe the offices of that Holy Spirit. "It works in the human race the will of the Father, and renews them from their old estate to the newness of Christ."[2] "It prepares them for God."[3] "As the flour cannot be consolidated and formed into a loaf without moisture, so we, being many, cannot be made one with Christ Jesus without the water which is from heaven: and as the parched earth brings forth no fruit, if it receives no dew; so we, being dry trees at first, should never bear the fruit of life without *rain freely imparted from above*. For our bodies derive that union (with Christ) unto immortality through the laver; but our souls through the Spirit."[4] "This dew of God," Irenæus afterwards adds, "is necessary for us, that we be neither burned up, nor unfruitful, and that where we have an accuser we may have also an Advocate;"[5] an Advocate of such power, too, that at his coming, Satan fell like lightning.[6] Nor is this all: in that taste for seeing typical meanings in everything, to which I have already adverted as characteristic of the Fathers, Irenæus discovers, in

[1] Spiritum quidem interimunt, alium autem Christum et alium Jesum intelligunt.—Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 4. See also, c. xi. § 9. Ut donum Spiritus frustrentur.

[2] Voluntatem patris operans in ipsis et renovans eos a vetustate in novitatem Christi.—III. c. xvii. § 1.

[3] Qui nos aptaret Deo.—§ 2.

[4] Sicut enim de arido tritico massa una fieri non potest sine humore, neque unus panis: ita nec nos multi unum fieri in Christo Jesu poteramus sine aquâ, quæ de cœlo est. Et sicut arida terra, si non percipiat humorem, non fructificat: sic et nos, lignum aridum existentes primum, nunquam fructificaremus vitam sine supernâ voluntariâ pluviâ. Corpora enim nostra per lavacrum illam, quæ est ad incorruptionem, unitatem acceperunt; animæ autem per Spiritum.—Ibid.

[5] Quapropter necessarius nobis est ros Dei, ut non comburamur, neque infructuosi efficiamur, ut ubi accusatorem habemus, illic habeamus et Paracletum.—§ 3.

[6] Ibid.

the two imperial coins which the good Samaritan gave to the innkeeper, "the image and superscription of the Father and the Son, which the Spirit imparts to us, that we may profit withal;"[1] as though all our holy impressions were derived from the influence of the Spirit. And when explaining the text, "for flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God," and taking it out of the hands of the Gnostics, he proceeds, "For since *without the Spirit of God we cannot be saved*, the Apostle exhorts us by faith and a chaste conversation to cherish that Spirit of God, that we may not fall short of the kingdom of heaven through not being partakers of the Spirit of God, and so he exclaims, 'but flesh and blood cannot of itself enter into the kingdom of God.'"[2] And in a short prayer, into which on one occasion he is betrayed, he cries, "O Lord God of Abraham, God of Isaac, God of Jacob, ... I beseech thee, by our Lord Jesus Christ, give unto me the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and grant that all who read these writings of mine, may acknowledge thee the only God; may be steadfast in thee; and turn away from every heretical, godless, and impious thought;"[3] a clear testimony to the need we have, both teacher and taught, of the Spirit of God, to direct and purify the heart.

Clemens Alexandrinus, given as he is to philosophize, still furnishes ample proof that the doctrine of grace was recognised by him also. Having said that the advent of the Word, and the sacred virtues he diffused, had superseded all other teaching, that even of Athens and Greece merged in it; he continues, "Wherefore, so to speak, Christ is whole and not divided; there is neither barbarian, nor Jew, nor Greek, neither male nor female, but a new man, transfigured by the Holy Spirit of God."[4] And shortly afterwards follows the illustration, "As, if there were no sun, the other stars would leave all in night; so, if we did not know the Word, and were not enlightened by it, we should be in the condition of fowls put up to feed, which are fattened in the dark, and

[1] Dans duo denaria regalia, ut per Spiritum imaginem et inscriptionem Patris et Filii accipientes, fructificemus creditum nobis denarium.—Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 3.

[2] Ἐπεὶ ἄνευ Πνεύματος Θεοῦ σωθῆναι οὐ δυνάμεθα, προτρεπόμενος ἡμᾶς ὁ ἀπόστολος, κ.τ.λ.—Irenæus, V. c. ix. § 3.

[3] III. c. vi. § 4.

[4] Καινὸς δὲ ἄνθρωπος, Θεοῦ Πνεύματι ἁγίῳ μεταπεπλασμένος.—Clem. Alex. Cohortatio ad Græcos, § xi. p. 87.

nourished for death. Let us receive the light that we may receive God."[1] Again, the quickening and purifying power of the Spirit is confessed in the following sentiment, "Wherefore, he who commits fornication dies altogether unto God, and is left by the Word, *as well as by the Spirit, lifeless.*"[2] Again, whilst objecting to cosmetics for the face, Clemens adds a sentence expressing in strong terms the doctrine of spiritual influence: "But the best beauty is that of the soul, as we have often declared, when it is adorned with the Holy Ghost, and is breathed into by those graces which proceed from the Spirit—righteousness, wisdom, fortitude, prudence, goodness, modesty; never was there a complexion more beautiful than this."[3] Again, "since some are unbelieving and some contentious, all do not attain unto the perfection of goodness, for it is not possible to attain unto it without a disposition to do so. Nevertheless it does not altogether depend on our own will, how it will turn out; for *by grace are we saved*: not, however, without good works, but being born for what is good we must feel a zeal for it; and we must possess ourselves, too, of a sound mind, such as will not draw back in its pursuit of goodness. To which end we have great need of *Divine grace*, and of right instruction, and of holy and sensitive affections, and of the *Father to draw us unto himself.*"[4] Again, of his Gnostic, or perfect Christian, Clemens asserts, that "real good, the good which appertains to the soul, is what he prays may belong unto him, and abide with him. For this cause he covets nothing which he has not, being content with what he has: for he is not wanting in goods of his own, seeing he has that which suffices for

[1] Clem. Alex. Cohortatio ad Græcos, § xi. p. 87.

[2] Διὸ καὶ πάντως ὁ πορνεύων ἀπέθανεν Θεῷ, καὶ καταλέλειπται ἀπὸ τοῦ Λόγου, καθάπερ ὑπὸ τοῦ Πνεύματος, νεκρός.—Pædag. II. c. x. p. 230.

[3] Κάλλος γὰρ ἄριστον, πρῶτον μὲν τὸ ψυχικόν, ὡς πολλάκις ἐπεσημηνάμην· ὅτ' ἂν ᾖ κεκοσμημένη ψυχὴ ἁγίῳ Πνεύματι, καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τούτου ἐμπνεομένη φαιδρύσμασιν, δικαιοσύνῃ, φρονήσει, ἀνδρίᾳ, σωφροσύνῃ, φιλαγαθίᾳ τε, καὶ αἰδοῖ· ἧς οὐδὲν εὐανθέστερον χρῶμα ἑώραται πώποτε.—Pædag. III. c. xi. p. 291.

[4] Ἐπεὶ δὲ οἱ μὲν ἄπιστοι, οἱ δὲ ἐριστικοὶ, οὐ πάντες τυγχάνουσι τῆς τελειότητος τοῦ ἀγαθοῦ. Οὔτε γὰρ ἄνευ προαιρέσεως τυχεῖν οἷόν τε· οὐ μὴν οὐδὲ τὸ πᾶν ἐπὶ τῇ γνώμῃ τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ κεῖται· οἷον τὸ ἀποβησόμενον· χάριτι γὰρ σωζόμεθα· οὐκ ἄνευ μέντοι τῶν καλῶν ἔργων· ἀλλὰ δεῖ μὲν πεφυκότας πρὸς τὸ ἀγαθὸν, σπουδήν τινα περιποιήσασθαι πρὸς αὐτὸ· δεῖ δὲ καὶ τὴν γνώμην ὑγιῆ κεκτῆσθαι, τὴν ἀμετανόητον πρὸς τὴν θήραν τοῦ καλοῦ· πρὸς ὅπερ μάλιστα τῆς θείας χρῄζομεν χάριτος, διδασκαλίας τε ὀρθῆς, καὶ εὐπαθείας ἀγνῆς, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πατρὸς πρὸς αὐτὸν ὁλκῆς.—Stromat. V. § i. p. 647.

himself, through the *Divine grace*, and through knowledge: but being satisfied, and having no wants, acquainted with the Almighty Will, in what he has, and in what he prays for, he cleaves to the Power Omnipotent, and striving to be spiritual, through unbounded love, *to the Spirit he is united.*"[1] Once more, the same doctrine discovers itself in the following paragraph; he is commenting on the text, "If thou wilt be perfect:"[2]—"Divinely does that expression, 'if thou wilt,'" says Clemens, "indicate the freedom of will of the soul who was conversing with (Jesus), for in man, as being free, subsists the *choice*, but to God, as Lord, belongs *the gift;* and he gives to those who wish it, and who desire it earnestly, and who intreat him for it, that so salvation may be still their own."[3] Indeed, the Gnostic, or true Christian, as presented to us in the portraiture of Clemens, exhibits one perpetually going on unto perfection under the guidance and influence of the Spirit: so that to produce passages which testify to the doctrine of spiritual influence would be to transcribe a great part of the "Stromata." Thus, to take him at his devotions; "he prays every hour internally, familiarizing himself with God through love. And first of all, he will ask for remission of his sins; then that he may sin no more; then that he may be able to do good, and to comprehend the whole creation and dispensation of the Lord; and that becoming pure in heart by the knowledge which he has through the Son of God, he may be initiated into the blessed spectacle face to face, listening to the Scripture which saith, Fasting together with prayer is good."[4] It is evident that language of this kind could not be held by one who did not acknowledge in a very unequivocal manner the doctrine of grace. And though it is true that the phraseology of Clemens is often borrowed from the schools of philosophy, yet that is to be regarded as his peculiar nomenclature; Christianity, as I have before said, being with him philosophy of the sublimest kind.

Tertullian was so far from disallowing the doctrine of the influence of the Spirit, that probably his zeal for it partly prepared him for the reception of the errors of Montanus;

[1] Stromat. VII. § vii. p. 857.
[2] Matt. xix. 21.
[3] Quis dives salvetur, § x. p. 940.
[4] Stromat. VI. § xii. p. 791; Tobit, xii. 8.

errors in which this very subject was deeply involved. For the Paraclete of Montanus appears to have been understood of no other being than the Holy Ghost; the same who inspired the Apostles, though in a lower degree than Montanus.[1] Accordingly, in his tract "De Spectaculis," Ter-

[1] Bishop Kaye, who investigates the precise nature of the pretensions of Montanus, remarks that Mosheim appears at different times to have held different opinions on the subject. In his De Rebus Christianorum ante Constantinum (Sæculum secundum, c. 66) he considers Montanus to have asserted himself to be inspired by the same Holy Spirit as the Apostles: in his Ecclesiastical History (Century ii. c. 5, p. 297, note) to have pretended to be himself the Paraclete; the Paraclete promised by the Saviour, and distinct from the Holy Spirit which spake by the Apostles. Bishop Kaye coincides with the former opinion, and gives his reasons for thinking that Mosheim misunderstood Tertullian, when he imputed to him the other. It is certainly difficult to read the writings of Tertullian—those, I mean, evidently composed after his accession to the Montanists, and in which the expression "nova prophetia," or the like, occurs, marking their date in this respect with precision—it is difficult, I say, to read these writings, and fail to perceive that Tertullian, when penning them, was unconscious of his creed being inconsistent with the fundamental articles of the Catholic faith. And yet this sentiment he scarcely could have entertained, had he swerved from it so widely, as to hold that there were two Holy Ghosts, the one the Spirit who animated the Apostles, the other Montanus himself. Moreover, in his treatise, De Jejuniis, § 1, written as a Montanist, he boldly accuses the orthodox, or animalists (psychicos), as he calls them, of "raising a debate about the Paraclete, and resisting the new prophecy, not because Montanus, Priscilla, and Maximilla, preached any other God than the true, or rejected Jesus Christ, or overturned any rule of faith or hope; but simply because they taught, it was better to fast than to marry;" words which would surely seem to imply a confidence in his own *substantial* orthodoxy, as well as in that of his sect. Furthermore, in some of his treatises clearly composed after he turned Montanist, he is as free as possible in his animadversions on *heretics;* plainly showing that he felt no imputation of that kind could fairly rest on himself. Thus in his De Resurrectione Carnis, c. iii. he classes them with heathens. In his De Carne Christi, c. xv., another of his tracts written after his lapse, he speaks of them in the same language, as well as accuses them of mutilating Scripture, c. ii. And in his Scorpiace, a third, still written after the same event, he designates them as "scorpions," the very title, indeed, of the treatise being, an antidote against their poison, c. i. And yet, on the other hand, in his De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, c. lii., a work, I think, certainly composed by him whilst he was an acknowledged member of the Church, he apparently does ascribe to the Montanists the very doctrine which I before said it seems hardly possible that any one could hold and yet suppose that he was true to the Catholic Church, viz. that there were two Holy Ghosts; or in other words, that the Holy Ghost was one, and the Paraclete another. "There are other heretics," says he in the passage in question, "after the manner of the Phrygians, as it is called; but they differ one from another. . . . . They hold one blasphemy, however, in common, that the Apostles had the Holy Ghost, but had not the Paraclete; and that the Paraclete revealed more through Montanus than Christ through the Gospel." "Accesserunt alii hæretici, qui dicuntur secundum Phrygas; sed horum non una doctrina est. Sunt enim qui *κατὰ* Proclum dicuntur, sunt qui secundum Æschinem pronuntiantur. Hi habent aliam communem blasphemiam, aliam blasphemiam non communem, sed peculiarem suam: et communem quidem illam, quâ in Apostolis quidem dicant Spiritum Sanctum fuisse, Paracletum non fuisse: et quâ dicant Paracletum plura in Montano dixisse, quam

tullian expresses himself thus:—"God hath commanded us to use the Holy Spirit with gentleness and meekness, in quiet and in peace, seeing that from the excellency of its own nature, it is tender and delicate; and not to disturb it by rage or ill-humour, by anger or grief. Now how does this comport with attendance at the shows?"[1] The reference here made to Ephes. iv. 30, "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God," proves that Tertullian, when writing thus, had the third Person of the Trinity in contemplation; and the passage affirms the doctrine of spiritual influence. Again, in his "De Virginibus Velandis," he describes the several offices of the Paraclete, there, too, identified with the Holy Ghost. Having briefly recited the substance of the primitive creed, he continues, "This rule of faith, then, remaining fixed, other matters, touching discipline and deportment, admit of corrective innovations, for the grace of God operates and improves even unto the end of time. For how could it be that, whilst the devil is always at work, and adding every day to his schemes of mischief, the operations of God should either expire or cease to advance? Whereas God sent the Paraclete for this very thing, that as the moderate capacity of man could not receive all things at once, it might by degrees be guided and ordered, and perfected by discipline, through the Holy Ghost, who was to be in the Lord's stead. 'I have yet

Christum in Evangelio protulisse." Here, I say, Tertullian asserts that the Montanists made a distinction between the Holy Spirit and the Paraclete; and calls such distinction blasphemy. Yet we have seen, that when a Montanist himself he had not ceased to regard himself as substantially orthodox; nor felt his hands tied from denouncing heretics. A recollection of passages on both sides of this question probably perplexed Mosheim, and caused him to hold one opinion upon it at one time, and another at another. Might not the inconsistency of Tertullian (for inconsistency I think I have shown there is) have arisen from this; that when he charges the Montanists with holding a Paraclete distinct from the Holy Ghost, and which sentiment he calls a blasphemy, he was a Churchman, and was attacking the Montanists without having more than a *general* knowledge of their reputed principles: but that when he identifies the Paraclete with the Holy Ghost, and claims for the Montanists substantial soundness of doctrine, he was himself a Montanist, and so more accurately informed in their opinions? And it may be added, that those opinions admitted of being correctly ascertained, inasmuch as they were committed to writing; references to such documents occurring in three treatises of Tertullian; that De Resurrectione Carnis, c. xi.; that De Fugâ in Persecutione, c. ix.; and that De Pudicitiâ; all of them, it may be remarked, written after Tertullian became a Montanist; and thus confirming my notion, that after his conversion he had studied the tenets of the sect more carefully, and was accordingly better able to pronounce with truth upon them, and more interested in seeing that justice should be done them.

[1] Tertullian, De Spectaculis, c. xv.

many things to say unto you,' he exclaimed, 'but ye cannot bear them now. When he the Spirit of Truth is come, he will lead you into all truth, and he will show you things to come.'[1] And he had before spoken of his office. What, then, is the business of the Paraclete but this, to *direct discipline, to open the Scriptures, to reform the understanding, to make the world better.*"[2] Elsewhere he gives several clauses of the creed as follows: "On the third day he (Jesus Christ) rose again; ascended into heaven; sat at the right hand of God; and sent the vicarious influence of the Holy Ghost to actuate the faithful."[3] And again, in other places, he designates the Holy Ghost as the Vicar of Christ, "Christi Vicarius;" the Steward of God, "Dei Villicus;" and asks whether it is credible that he will allow the Churches to fall into error, being sent to lead them into all truth[4]; surely a very ample assertion of the doctrine we are in search of.

Cyprian bears witness to the same article of the faith. Advocate as we saw he was, like the other Fathers, for the freedom of the will, he nevertheless writes, when explaining the clause of the Lord's Prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven;" "here we pray that God's will may be done by us; in order to which we must have God's will in us, that is, his help and protection, seeing that *no one is strong in his own strength, but is only strong in the indulgence and compassion of God.*"[5] Again, his "Testimonies against the Jews," a summary of Christian doctrines and precepts succinctly collected by Cyprian out of Scripture, at the request and for the benefit of Quirinus, furnishes the following apothegm: "the grace of God is a free gift."[6] And that the grace of God is not here to be understood irrespectively of the Holy Ghost, is plain from the first text of Scripture cited by Cyprian in support of his proposition, namely, St. Peter's rebuke to Simon, "Thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought that the gift of God may be purchased with money."[7] And once more, where, as in the last

[1] John xvi. 12.

[2] De Virginibus Velandis, c. i.

[3] De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, c. xiii.

[4] c. xxviii.

[5] Oramus et petimus, ut fiat in nobis voluntas Dei, quæ ut fiat, in nobis opus est Dei voluntate, id est ope ejus et protectione: quia *nemo suis viribus fortis est*, sed Dei indulgentiâ et misericordiâ tutus est.—Cyprian, De Oratione Dominicâ, § xiv.

[6] Testimoniorum, III. cap. c.

[7] Ibid.

quotation, not merely the doctrine of spiritual influence is recognised, but the freedom with which it is vouchsafed to all who seek it. "As the sun shines freely, the day disperses its light, the fountain its waters, the shower its dew, so doth *the heavenly Spirit infuse* itself. When the soul, looking up to heaven, hath learned to know its Author, then it is that, higher than the sun, more sublime than any or every power upon this earth, it begins to be that which it believes it is. Only do thou, whom the heavenly warfare hath enlisted by its mark into the spiritual camp, cleave to its discipline, uncorrupt as it is, and sober as it is, with every religious virtue. Pray or read without ceasing. Now converse with God; now God converses with thee. Let him instruct thee in his precepts, let him dispose of thee. Whom he hath made rich, none can make poor. He can feel no poverty, whose breast the heavenly banquet has satisfied once for all. Roofs adorned with gold, houses empanelled with slabs of precious marble, will be mean in thy sight, for thou wilt know rather that it is thyself which is to be dressed, thyself to be ornamented, that thou hast in thyself a better house, a house in which the Lord hath seated himself, instead of a temple, and in which the Holy Spirit hath *begun to dwell.*"[1] Again, "Patience, brethren beloved, not only guards the good, but repels the evil. *Seconding the Holy Spirit,* and allying itself with the divine and heavenly principle, in opposition to the deeds of the flesh and body, by which the soul is vanquished and taken captive, it struggles in the defence of its own virtues."[2]

Origen bears testimony to the same truth. Thus he explains John xiv. 12, "Greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father," by the spiritual effects on the souls of men which the disciples were to be enabled to accomplish—effects far more striking than the physical miracles wrought by Jesus—thus, "the eyes of those who were blind in soul were to be opened; the ears of those who had been deaf to the accents of virtue were to be made to listen with eagerness to the things pertaining unto God and everlasting life with him; those who were lame in the inner man were not only to leap, but to leap like a stag, an animal hostile to serpents, and which the poison of vipers cannot hurt," and so

[1] Epist. i. §§ 14, 15. [2] De Bono Patientiæ, § xiv.

on.[1] Again, in commenting on the text, "My speech and my preaching was not with enticing words of man's wisdom, but in demonstration of the Spirit, and of power,"[2] he says, "What is spoken, however true and worthy of all belief, is not competent of itself to reach the human soul, unless *a certain power from God* be vouchsafed the speaker, and *grace* give a beauty to what he utters; such grace as must come from God, in order to render the speaker effective. . . . Accordingly, if it should seem to be granted that in some particulars the same sentiments are expressed by the Greeks and by the Christians" (which was what Celsus had asserted), "still their effect would not be the same; so as to lead and dispose men's souls to the same ends."[3] Once more, in another of his works, "He who is not aware of his own weakness, and of the *divine grace*, not having proved himself, nor condemned himself; such an one, even if he should receive the blessing, will suppose that the virtue vouchsafed him from the *heavenly grace* is, in fact, his own. And this supposition, puffing him up, will be the cause of a fall. . . . . Know then that divine things are hidden from the wise and prudent, that, as the Apostle says, no flesh may glory before God; and they are revealed unto babes, who have advanced beyond their infancy, and are mindful that they have arrived at the point of blessedness they have reached, not so much through *any power of their own*, as through the unspeakable goodwill of God."[4] And again, in the same treatise, "So that neither is he that planteth anything, neither he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase. And we could not say with reverence that an abundant harvest is the doing of him who plougheth, or of him who watereth; but must confess it to be the work of God. And in like manner therefore our perfection is not brought about, whilst we are ourselves altogether inactive, neither *again is it consummated by ourselves; but God works out the chief part of it.*"[5] And again, in another of his treatises, that on prayer, "If no one knows the things of God, save the Spirit of God, it is impossible for man to know the things of God. And yet learn how this impossibility is rendered possible; 'now we have

[1] Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 48.
[2] 1 Cor. ii. 4.
[3] Contra Celsum, VI. § 2.
[4] De Principiis, III. c. i. § 12.
[5] § 18.

received not the spirit of the world,' says the Scripture, 'but the Spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God.'"[1] And once more in the same, "'I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also; I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.'[2] For our understanding cannot pray, unless the Spirit precede it in prayer, and do so, as it were, within hearing of it."[3]

[1] 1 Cor. ii. 12; Origen, De Oratione, § 1.

[2] 1 Cor. xiv. 15.

[3] De Oratione, § 2.

LECTURE XIV.

The testimony of the Fathers opposed to the Calvinistic scheme of interpretation, 3°. On the nature of spiritual influence. The language of the Fathers incompatible with the Calvinistic doctrine of irresistible grace. 4°. On election and reprobation. What the Fathers understood by the terms, foreknown, elect, predestined, saints. Their exposition of passages of Scripture relating to this subject. Prophecy, according to them, an evidence of the Divine Foreknowledge, yet not so as to control the contingency of events. Tenets akin to the Calvinistic ascribed by Origen to the Valentinians. His exposition of Rom. ix.

§ 3.

On the Nature of Spiritual Influence.

I HAVE already said that the language of the Fathers, however decisive on the subject of spiritual influence, and decisive we have seen it is, nevertheless does not represent that influence as irresistible, but simply as persuasive. There will be no need to enter into much detail upon this point. The freedom of the will, on which we have found all the Fathers so emphatic, is in itself incompatible with the Calvinistic doctrine of irresistible grace. Moreover, the terms in which the sentiments of the Fathers on the question before us are conveyed, as already cited, imply as much.[1] Still, if direct evidence to this effect be required, it is easy to produce it. Thus Irenæus: "It is not the light that fails when people put out their own eyes. But the light remaining as it was, they who have blinded themselves are in darkness through their own fault. Neither does the light force *a man to be led by it of necessity*,

[1] See *e. g.* those from Tertullian. Deus præcepit Spiritum sanctum, utpote pro naturæ suæ bono tenerum et delicatum, tranquillitate, et quiete et pace tractare, non furore, non bile, non irâ, non dolore inquietare.—De Spectaculis, c. xv.

Quæ est ergo Paracleti administratio nisi hæc, quod disciplina dirigitur, quod Scripturæ revelantur, quod intellectus reformatur, quod ad meliora proficitur? —De Virginibus Velandis, c. i.

nor does *God constrain him against his will to receive his influence.*"[1] Again, "All which things discover the freedom of man's will, and the persuasive power of God, who exhorts us to obey him, turns us from unbelief, but still *does not force us.*"[2] And he afterwards makes it characteristic of brutes as distinguished from man, "to be dragged to what is good by necessity and force."[3]

Clemens Alexandrinus (to name one authority more on the same subject), after insisting on the gift or grace of God being necessary in order to make the Christian perfect, adds, that in imparting this gift, God is regulated by the desire man evinces to obtain it, still, however, having respect to the freedom of the will. "For God *does not compel, since force is hateful to God:* but he gives to those who seek; supplies those who beg; and opens to those who knock."[4]

§ 4.

On Election and Reprobation.

The same reason which rendered it unnecessary to enlarge very much on the last head, renders it equally so to dwell at great length on the doctrine of election and reprobation, as viewed by the Fathers: their unequivocal assertion of the freedom of the will applying alike to this, as to the doctrine of irresistible grace, and compatible with neither. However, as this question has long occupied, and still does occupy, so prominent a position in the field of theological controversy, I will produce a few quotations from the Fathers directly indicating their opinion on it.

Justin Martyr speaks often of "the foreknown" (*οἱ προεγνωσμένοι*), sometimes in the sense of future Christians, "All the other institutions of Moses I could enumerate, and point them out as types and symbols and declarations of things which

[1] Οὔτε τὸ φῶς ἐξασθενεῖ διὰ τοὺς ἑαυτοῖς τυφλώττοντας· ἀλλ' ἐκείνου μένοντος ὁποῖον καὶ ἔστιν, οἱ τυφλωθέντες παρὰ τὴν αἰτίαν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐν ἀορασίᾳ καθίστανται, μήτε τοῦ φωτὸς μετ' ἀνάγκης δουλαγωγοῦντός τινα, μήτε τοῦ Θεοῦ βιαζομένου, εἰ μὴ θέλοι τις κατασχεῖν αὐτοῦ τὴν τέχνην. — Irenæus, IV. c. xxxix. § 3.

[2] IV. c. xxxvii. § 3.

[3] § 6.

[4] Οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκάζει ὁ Θεός, βίᾳ γὰρ ἐχθρὸν Θεῷ, ἀλλὰ τοῖς ζητοῦσι πορίζει, καὶ τοῖς αἰτοῦσι παρέχει, καὶ τοῖς κρούουσιν ἀνοίγει. — Clem. Alex. Quis dives salvetur, § x. p. 940.

were to happen to Christ, of persons who were foreknown as about to believe in him, and of acts which were to be done by Christ himself:"[1] sometimes in the sense of good persons who were to be saved; not, however, because they were A or B, but because they were virtuous: "But that God, the Father of all things, was to take up Christ to heaven after his resurrection from the dead, and to keep him there till he should have smitten down the evil spirits that hate him, and the *number of good and virtuous foreknown* to him should be wholly completed, for whose sakes he has not yet brought on the conflagration of the world, learn from the words of the prophet David;"[2] "the foreknown" here used in the same manner as the "elect" in our Burial Service, in which we pray that God would "shortly accomplish the number of his elect, and hasten his kingdom." As again Justin also speaks of those respecting whom it was foreknown that they would be wicked, and suffer punishment, "not, however, through any fault of God's, but through their own fault;"[3] the salvation of the parties foreknown ex prævisis meritis, the condemnation ex prævisis delictis.

Irenæus is of the same mind. "The Father," says he, "revealed himself *to all*, by making his Word visible to all; and the Word again manifested the Father and the Son to all, by being himself seen of all. Wherefore the judgment of God is just towards all, who though they have seen alike do not alike believe."[4] And again, "As at the first, by the first man all were brought into bondage by the debt of death, so at the last, by the last man, *all* who had been his disciples from the beginning of time, cleansed and purified from mortality, come to the life of God. For he who washed only the feet of his disciples, sanctified and made clean the whole body. . . . . For it was not for those only who believed in him in the days of Tiberius Cæsar that Christ came, nor for those only that are now alive, that the Father was making provision, but for *all men whatever* who from the beginning by virtue in their generations feared and loved God, carried themselves justly and charitably towards their neighbours, and desired to see Christ and to hear his voice."[5] Again,

[1] Justin Martyr, Dial. § 42. And see also § 70.
[2] Apol. I. § 45.
[3] Dial. § 140.
[4] Irenæus, IV. c. vi. § 5.
[5] c. xxii. §§ 1, 2.

Irenæus finds a type of the dispensation of grace in the proceedings with regard to the fleece of Gideon; on which only there was dew at first, whilst all the earth besides was dry; but presently it was so ordered, that the fleece only was dry, and there was dew on all the ground: whereby was signified in a figure, that whilst the chosen people, who once enjoyed the Holy Spirit, were bereaved of it, "the Lord committed it to the Church, imparting it to the whole world."[1] It is remarkable, too, that St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, which has furnished the Calvinist with so many of his arguments for the doctrine of election and reprobation, is actually singled out by Irenæus as the very ground on which he contends for the doctrine of man's liberty of choice to do good or evil; and of God's consequent right to assign him his reward accordingly.[2] There is, however, one passage in Irenæus, and I think only one, which might at first sight seem to favour the Calvinistic notion of election. He is combating the idea of the transmigration of souls, which some of the heretics, it seemed, entertained; and having observed that God is not needy or in difficulties, so as not to be able to supply its proper soul to each body, he continues, "wherefore when the number which he has of himself predetermined, is completed, all who are *put down for life* will rise again with their own bodies, their own souls, and their own spirits, the same in which they have pleased God: and they who *deserve* punishment will depart to it; they, too, having their own bodies, souls, and spirits, the same in which they fell away from the grace of God; and both the one and the other will cease to beget or to be begotten, to marry or to be given in marriage, in order that the *number of mankind measured according to the predestination of God* being filled up, may harmonize with the plan of the Father."[3] Here, however, we have simply the sentiment expressed by Justin repeated; namely, that when the number of souls which God has decreed in his secret counsels to be created or saved, shall have been made up, no more will be produced; a position perfectly consistent with a free offer of salvation to all.

Tertullian is as explicit on this question as the Fathers

[1] Quem ipsum iterum dedit ecclesiæ, in omnem terram mittens de cœlis Paracletum.—Irenæus, III. c. xvii. § 3.

[2] IV. c. xxxvii. § 1.

[3] II. c. xxxiii. § 5.

before him. Thus, in his treatise "De Cultu Fœminarum,"[1] the predestined are the future body of Christians. "Ye, too, have had use enough of riches and luxuries; ye gathered fruit enough of the gifts with which ye are endowed, before the doctrines of salvation became known to you. We are they on whom the ends of the world are come. We are they who were *destined of God* for the last times, before the world was. Therefore by chastening and emasculating the world, so to speak, we are taught of the Lord." Elsewhere he expresses the Christians by the word "saints;" "fœminæ sanctæ" in his vocabulary being evidently equivalent to Christian women in general, as contrasted with heathen[2]; his advice respecting marriage, though addressed to his wife in contemplation of her widowhood, being intended for all Christian women whatever. In his treatise against Marcion,[3] who disparages the Deity by various arguments drawn from the existence of evil, he says, "God, by now desiring that man should be restored to life, gives proof that *he never was appointed unto death;* for he would rather have the repentance than the death of the sinner. Wherefore, as God imparted to man a state of life, so did man draw upon himself a state of death." "God," he tells us in the same treatise,[4] "hardened Pharaoh's heart; but then he had *deserved* his ruin to be thus prepared for him, because he had denied God, and repeatedly rejected his messengers." In a similar spirit he interprets St. Matthew xiii. 15. "For this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them;" saying,[5] "For they had *deserved* to have their senses which would have ministered to their salvation thus blunted, because they only loved God with their lips, whilst their hearts were far from him." And in another place of the same tract (for the character of the heresy he was opposing in it causes it to be prolific in passages to my present purpose) he writes, Marcion accuses the Deity of fickleness with respect to persons, rejecting those whom he had approved, and of im-

[1] Tertullian, De Cultu Fœminarum, II. c. ix. [2] Ad Uxorem, II. c. i. [3] Adversus Marcionem, II. c. viii. [4] c. xiv. [5] Hanc enim obtusionem salutarium sensuum meruerant, etc.—III. c. vi.

providence, approving those whom he had rejected. But replies Tertullian,[1] "Saul was chosen when he had not yet despised the prophet Samuel; and Solomon was rejected, but it was when he had become enslaved to strange women, and to Moabitish and Sidonian idols. What would the Marcionites have the Creator do to escape their censure? *Should he condemn beforehand for offences hereafter to be committed, those who are at present acting well?* Surely it would not be the part of a good God to condemn beforehand those who do not yet deserve condemnation." And the absolute repugnance to the doctrine of *assurance*—a doctrine so intimately connected with that of election and reprobation—which we elsewhere find in him, is a further argument that the passages I have already extracted from him bespeak his mind correctly. Decorating the person, argues Tertullian,[2] invites the appetite; produces, therefore, temptation to the party; should consequently be avoided. "We ought to walk in the fulness of a substantial faith, that we may be secure in a good conscience, hoping that this may continue in us, but not presuming that it will. For he *who presumes has the less fear*: he who fears little has the less caution: he who has little caution is in the greatest danger. Fear is the foundation of safety; presumption is the preventive of fear. It is more profitable, therefore, for us to *hope* that we cannot transgress, than to *presume* that we cannot."

Clemens Alexandrinus presents himself to us next, and offers the same testimony on this important question, as the other primitive writers who have gone before him. He, too, regards "the elect" as the whole body of Christians. It had been objected to the Christians that if God had any regard for them he would not expose them, as he did, to persecution and violent death. To this Clemens makes answer, that no

[1] Adlegitur Saul, sed nondum despector prophetæ Samuelis. Rejicitur Salomon, sed jam a mulieribus alienis possessus, et idolis Moabitarum et Sidoniorum mancipatus. Quid faceret Creator, ne a Marcionitis reprehenderetur? Bene adhuc agentes prædamnaret jam propter futura delicta? sed Dei boni non erat, nondum merentes prædamnare.—Adversus Marcionem, II. c. xxiii.

[2] Debemus quidem ita sancte et totâ fidei substantiâ incedere, ut confessæ et securæ simus de conscientiâ nostrâ optantes perseverare id in nobis, non tamen præsumentes. Nam qui præsumit, minus veretur, minus præcavet, plus periclitatur. Timor fundamentum salutis est, præsumptio impedimentum timoris. Utilius ergo, si speremus non posse delinquere, quam si præsumamus non posse, etc.—De Cultu Fœminarum, II. c. ii.

real injury is done them in a removal by a quick migration to God; and moreover, that "unless the Christians were generally looked upon as bad men, all mankind would come to the truth; rush into the right way; and *there would be no election at all.* Whereas their faith being set as the light of the world, puts infidelity to rebuke."[1] I do not quote the passage for the value of the argument, but for the indication it affords of the meaning of the term "elect." And accordingly these are they whom God is described as foreseeing before their birth; he knowing what shall be, just as well as what is.[2] The "predestinate" Clemens understands in the same sense; and actually, in speaking of them, alludes to the Epistle to the Romans as confirming his views, and to the eighth chapter of it; apparently unconscious of any such doctrine being in it as that extracted from it by the Calvinist.[3] "He who positively assumed for our sake a body that could suffer, cannot be indifferent towards us out of apathy or self-indulgence. Surely he cares for all men, as befits one who is himself Lord of all. For he is a Saviour—not a Saviour of some, and no Saviour of others, but he dispenses his benefits in proportion as every one is prepared for them, both to Greeks and barbarians, to the *predestined out of either race,* called according to his own time, faithful, elect. Neither can he, who hath *called all alike,* and assigns peculiar rewards to such as have peculiar faith, be jealous of any." Elsewhere, in numerous places, he represents salvation as within the reach of all. Thus, having alluded to the reproach levelled against the hypocrites in the text which designates them "a generation of vipers," he adds, "yet if any even of these serpents is willing to repent, and to follow the Word, he becomes a man of God."[4] And in the Pædagogue, "'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you' . . . . for God hath communicated with our race, imparting to us spontaneously his own, and supplying his own Word to all mankind alike, doing all things for all men."[5] And in his "Quis dives salvetur," he is at pains to vindicate the Deity from being supposed to be exclusive. "I think, then," says he, "I

[1] Clem. Alex. Stromat. IV. § xi. p. 599.
[2] VII. § vii. p. 853.
[3] VII. § ii. p. 832.
[4] Cohortatio ad Græcos, § x. pp. 82, 83.
[5] Pædag. II. c. xii. p. 242.

have redeemed my promise, and have shown that the Saviour has by no means excluded the rich on account of their wealth and ample possessions, nor has fixed any gulf between them and salvation, if only they are able and willing to submit their lives to God's commandments, and set these before all temporal concerns, and look to the Lord with a steady eye, as men look to the nod of a skilful pilot, marking what he wishes, what he commands, what signal he gives his crew, what port he makes for."[1] But if Clemens thus causes it to appear that he cannot bear God's mercy to be circumscribed with respect to one class, we must feel satisfied that he would be equally loath to deny it to any other.

If we compare the several passages of Cyprian which bear on this subject, we shall come to the conclusion that his authority still ranges on the same side. In the epistle which he writes to Cornelius on the affair of Novatus, a paragraph occurs which, taken by itself, might seem to imply the contrary. "Touching the other brethren, whom to our sorrow he hath circumvented, we are striving to detach them from the side of this impostor, that they may escape the deadly snare of the seducer, and may again return to the Church, from which he justly earned it of God to be expelled; which persons, we have good hope, with God's help, and of his mercy, may retrace their steps. For none can perish except him who it is plain must perish, since the Lord says in his Gospel, 'Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up.'"[2] But then Cyprian adds a sentence which qualifies the apparent meaning of the previous words; "He who is not planted in the precepts and admonitions of God the Father, and he only, can depart from the Church:" the apostacy not depending on a decree of God, but on the precepts and admonitions of God never having taken root in the heart of the apostate; and accordingly Cyprian considers that a door was open to the return of all those who had been led astray by the heretic he is speaking of. This view is confirmed by many other places in Cyprian. Thus, in his treatise on Patience, after pressing the signal

[1] Quis dives salvetur, § xxvi. p. 950.

[2] Neque enim potest perire, nisi quem *constat* esse periturum, cum Dominus in evangelio suo dicat: Omnis plantatio, quam non plantavit Pater meus cœlestis, eradicabitur. Qui plantatus non est in præceptis Dei Patris et monitis, solus poterit de ecclesiâ illâ discedere, &c.—Cyprian, Epist. xlix. § 4.

example of this virtue yielded by the Saviour, and recounting the several proofs of it which the circumstances of his life, and especially those of his Passion, afforded, he concludes, "And after all these things, he still receives his murderers, if they turn and come to him; and in his patience, mild and merciful to save, he *closes his Church against no one.*"[1] Again, in an Epistle to Fidus on Infant Baptism, he describes the freedom with which God's grace is vouchsafed to all without respect to persons, in a manner quite inconsistent with a belief in the Calvinistic doctrine of election and reprobation. "Moreover, holy Scripture teaches us that the Divine gift is assigned in an equal measure to all, whether infants or adults. For Elisha stretched himself on the widow's dead child in prayer so as to apply hand to hand, face to face, feet to feet. Now if this incident be considered in reference to the bodily size of the parties, the infant cannot be measured against the man. But a Divine and spiritual equality is expressed by it, as though all men, when they have been once made by God, are equal and alike; any subsequent difference, through the growth of the body, being assignable to nature and not to God. Unless, indeed, the grace which is given in Baptism is to be accounted greater or less, according to the age of the recipient. Whereas the Holy Spirit is not given by measure, but by the pity and indulgence of the Father is given in an equal degree to all. For as God does not accept the person, so neither does he accept the age, but shows himself a Father to all alike, with regard to their acquirement of celestial grace."[2] Once more, when speaking of the case of a confessor who had afterwards fallen away, he says, "Such a man must not flatter himself on his confession, as though he was *elected* to the glorious prize, seeing that this very circumstance only rendered him more worthy of punishment. For the *Lord elected even Judas amongst the Apostles*, and Judas afterwards betrayed the Lord. But the faith and constancy of the Apostles did not fail, because Judas fell away from them, a traitor. And so in this case, the sanctity and dignity of the confessors does not take damage, because the faith of

[1] Et post ista omnia, adhuc interfectores suos, si conversi ad eum venerint, suscipit; et patientiâ salutari ad conservandum benignus et patiens, *ecclesiam suam nemini claudit.*—De Bono Patientiæ, § viii.

[2] Epist. lix. § 3.

certain amongst them had been wrecked."[1] The whole argument, both here and as it advances, is inconsistent with the Calvinistic doctrine of election. And finally, in the Epistle to Fortunatus, while at the request of that friend he endeavours to prepare the minds of the brethren for the persecution they might be called upon to encounter, by exhortations taken from Scripture, he reminds them in chapter vii., that being once delivered from the jaws of the devil, and from the snares of the world, they must not relapse, "for that no one who has put his hand to the plough, and looketh back, is fit for the kingdom of God;" and in chapter viii., that it is only by continuance in the faith that the crown can be won, for that "he that endureth to the end shall be saved:" with much more to the same purpose; the whole reasoning proceeding upon the assumption that no Divine decrees stood in the way of the success of the personal efforts he was recommending.

Hippolytus discovers his sentiments by the typical meaning he assigns to the posture of Jesus on the cross, who, by stretching out his arms right and left, invited all who believed to come to him.[2]

Origen is perhaps the last man of all the Fathers to whom the Calvinist can appeal with success, whether upon the question before us, or on any other which is peculiar to him. So far from the exclusionist, he is almost always the latitudinarian. Accordingly, in the present case, we find him contending against the doctrine of necessity, and maintaining that Christ "came the Saviour of all men:"[3] that "for the salvation of our race he at once gave himself up for the whole world, according as every one could receive him:"[4] nay, that after a succession of existences in which the souls of men will sink or rise according to their behaviour in each preceding stage, all will be saved; for that as "all enemies are finally to be subjected to him, the salvation of them all is implied, and an ultimate restoration of the lost"[5]; though it should seem to be an abuse of Origen's liberality to ascribe to him, as has

[1] De Unitate Ecclesiæ, §§ xxi. xxii.

[2] "Ος ἐκτείνας τὰς ἁγίας χεῖρας ἐν ἁγίῳ ξύλῳ ἥπλωσε δύο πτέρυγας δεξιὰν καὶ εὐώνυμον, προσκαλούμενος πάντας τοὺς εἰς αὐτὸν πιστεύοντας.—Hippolytus, De Christo et Antichristo, § lxi.

[3] Origen, Contra Celsum, IV. § 4.

[4] Τὸν ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν παντὶ τῷ κόσμῳ ἀθρόως ἑαυτὸν ὄντα Λόγον ὡς ἕκαστος χωρεῖ ἐπιδεδωκότα.—VIII. § 11.

[5] De Principiis, III. c. v. § 7.

been done, the doctrine that the devil himself is to be included in this amnesty—a notion which he rejects with abhorrence, as one which even a madman would not entertain.[1] We further discover him maintaining that prophecy, however it may and does prove God's foreknowledge, has no effect on the event, which would have been just the same, had there been no prophecy or no foreknowledge respecting it; that accordingly as the Psalm foretold of Judas, "he remembered not to show mercy, but persecuted the poor and needy man," it was in his own power to have remembered mercy, and it was in his own power to have forborne persecuting him whom he persecuted; and therefore that his condemnation was just: as in like manner the oracle having forewarned Laius not to sow the furrow for children, for that so doing he should be slain by his child, he might have abstained and lived, and therefore that his death was of his own seeking.[2] Again, when commenting on the parable of the sower, he remarks, "And this same rock is the human soul hardened through neglect, and petrified through wickedness; for *no man's heart was created stony by God*, but it became so through sin."[3] Thus the obduracy of the impenitent, according to Origen, is the effect of culpable negligence on their own part, and not of any Divine decrees. Nay, more, Origen actually ascribes it to the Valentinians, as an heretical opinion which the Church denounced, that some were *animal*, and some *spiritual*, some created to be saved, and some created to perish.[4] And what is more yet, he expressly claims St. Paul, as Irenæus had done before him,[5] as an advocate of his own views, even appealing to the ninth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, and explaining away such passages in it as seem to imply the contrary[6]; and, indeed, positively im-

[1] Quidam eorum qui libenter contentiones reperiunt, adscribunt nobis et nostræ doctrinæ blasphemiam, super quâ ipse viderint, quomodo illud audiant: Neque ebriosi, neque maledici regnum Dei possidebunt; licet patrem malitiæ et perditionis eorum qui de regno Dei ejicientur, dicant posse salvari, quod ne mente quidem quis captus dicere potest.—Epistola ad Amicos Alexandrinos, vol. i. p. 5.

[2] Contra Celsum, II. § 20.

[3] De Principiis, III. c. i. § 14.

[4] *Ἔστω δ' ἔτι καὶ τρίτον γένος τῶν ὀνομαζόντων ψυχικούς τινας, καὶ πνευματικοὺς ἑτέρους· οἶμαι δ' αὐτὸν λέγειν τοὺς ἀπὸ Οὐαλεντίνου. Καὶ τί τοῦτο πρὸς ἡμᾶς, τοὺς ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας, κατηγοροῦντας τῶν εἰσαγόντων φύσεις ἐκ κατασκευῆς σωζομένας, ἢ ἐκ κατασκευῆς ἀπολλυμένας;* —Contra Celsum, V. § 61. Compare De Principiis, II. c. ix. § 5.

[5] See p. 498.

[6] De Principiis, III. c. i. §§ 6, 7. 18. 20.

puting what would be now called the Calvinistic interpretation of it, to the heterodox or heretics.[1] And the meaning, which he thus assigns to this chapter, he confirms in his commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, which was of a date subsequent to the "De Principiis;" and there refers his readers to what he had said on the former occasion[2]; so that nothing can be more deliberate in this instance, at least, than his conclusions. Indeed, it may be added that this chapter of St. Paul, on which so much of the Predestinarian controversy is now made to rest, was never expounded by the Fathers for nearly four centuries with any direct reference to it.[3] It is true that Origen[4] is not content with neutralizing Romans ix. 21, "Hath not the potter power over the clay, to make one vessel unto honour and another unto dishonour?" by comparing it with 2 Tim. ii. 21, "If a man purge *himself* from these, he shall be a vessel unto honour," but proceeds to vindicate the justice of God by the theory (to which I have already alluded) that souls have pre-existed in other estates of being, and have been ushered by him into a succeeding estate, as vessels unto honour, or vessels unto dishonour, according to *their own* conduct in their previous scene of trial; still, a forced theory like this, only shows how repugnant to the Primitive Church the doctrines of fatalism were. Nor is it a less striking proof of the same fact, that Origen,[5] in his comment on such a text as Genesis i. 14, should think it necessary to argue at very great length, that God has given no dominant influence to the planets, and that mankind are under no mechanical constraint.

[1] Ἀρξώμεθα τοίνυν ἀπὸ τῶν περὶ τοῦ Φαραὼ εἰρημένων ὡς σκληρυνομένου ὑπὸ Θεοῦ, ἵνα μὴ ἐξαποστείλῃ τὸν λαόν· ᾧ συνεξετασθήσεται ἅμα τὸ ἀποστολικόν· ἄρ' οὖν ὃν θέλει ὁ Θεὸς ἐλεεῖ· ὃν δὲ θέλει σκληρύνει. Καὶ ἐπιχρῶνται τούτοις τῶν ἑτεροδόξων τινὲς, σχεδὸν καὶ αὐτοὶ τὸ αὐτεξούσιον ἀναιροῦντες, διὰ τὸ φύσεις εἰσάγειν ἀπολλυμένας, ἀνεπιδέκτους τοῦ σώζεσθαι, καὶ ἑτέρας σωζομένας, ἀδυνάτως ἐχούσας πρὸς τὸ ἀπολέσθαι, κ.τ.λ.—§ 8.

[2] Comment. in Roman. vol. iv. p. 614.

[3] Observandum 4°. Nonum caput ad Romanos, quod nunc fundus videtur totius doctrinæ de prædestinatione et reprobatione, non fuisse per quatuor pene sæcula ita expositum a SS. Patribus, ut ad hoc argumentum directe pertineret. —Bishop Pearson, Minor Theological Works, vol. i. p. 251.

[4] Origen, De Principiis, III. c. i. § 20.

[5] Comment. in Genes. vol. ii. p. 3.

LECTURE XV.

Use of the Fathers in unfolding the *meaning* of Scripture: III. Prevailing mistake of applying a modern standard of interpretation to passages which should be explained by reference to an ancient one. The information which the Fathers give on early heresies the true key to much of the New Testament. The method of Dr. Hammond substantially correct. Succession of heresies. Observation of Tertullian. Illustration of it from the writings of St. John. St. Paul explained with reference to the Gnostic heresy by Irenæus. Application of the same method by Tertullian. Further allusions to the doctrines and phraseology of the Gnostics discoverable in the Apostolical Epistles. IV. Interpretation of individual texts by the Fathers. Their comments not always to be relied on; yet often superior to those of modern days. Illustrations.

III.

THERE is another bias which affects the general interpretation of Scripture perhaps as much as the Socinian or the Calvinistic does; and that is, a disposition to regulate the meaning of Scripture by a modern rather than an ancient standard; to contemplate it from a late rather than an early position; and refer it to events of a contemporary rather than a primitive period—a bias the more to be provided against, because it suits the indolent; is easy and natural; requires little or no reading, study or penetration to follow: and accordingly it has made itself felt on the theology of the day, and especially on our Scripture commentators, with disastrous effect.

The Fathers prove of eminent use as guides to the interpretation of Scripture by moderating this principle: and this they do, as in other ways which I have noticed, so by furnishing us with accurate information concerning the heresies which prevailed in the Sub-Apostolic, and even the Apostolic times; that information supplying the true key to much of the New Testament. I have already touched from time to time on probable conclusions which such knowledge enables us to draw incidentally with respect to questions of great importance both ecclesiastical and religious; though I might have done so to a

much greater extent: as, that the Episcopal form of Church government was that sanctioned by Scripture, since even the heretics adopted it, only in their case futile, because wanting the succession[1]: that the doctrine of the Trinity was scriptural, even Simon Magus, so primitive a heretic, caricaturing it in his crazy system[2]: that the Sacrament of Baptism was according to Scripture a mystery of the highest virtue, seeing that the heretics had their Initiation corresponding to it, their Redemptio or ἀπολύτρωσις, as they called it,[3] and which, as some of them pretended, gave exemption from natural death[4]: that the Sacrament of the Eucharist was, according to Scripture, sanctified by the peculiar presence of God; even the heretics representing that Charis of their Pleroma dropped her blood into the cup, and imparted herself in it to her worshippers[5]: that faith and the Cross enter largely into the scheme of Scripture, since even the heretics must have amongst their Æons πίστις and σταυρος[6]: that the miraculous Conception must have been an acknowledged and well-known Scripture doctrine, since the same parties, instead of denying the fact, taught that Jesus passed through Mary as water through a tube.[7] But, besides these broader features of revelation, which the heresies of primitive times serve to illustrate, confirm and fix; they further act as exponents of many of the more obscure parts of holy Writ, and particularly of many passages in the Gospel of St. John, and in the Epistles whether of him or of other of the Apostles, passages which require the most delicate investigation, and often experience the most trivial. Indeed, Dr. Hammond, you are aware, considered the Gnostic heresy to be the solvent of almost all the difficulties of those portions of Scripture; as though St. John and St. Paul had it constantly in contemplation. Here again, as in a former instance, the principle of interpretation may have been occasionally overstrained; and may have been exercised on texts which possibly were to be explained by some other theory. But our own common sense must tell us, that the early heresies of the Church could not fail to enter largely into the views of the Apostles; and that though the question of more or less may admit of debate, the

[1] Irenæus, V. c. xx. § 1. Tertullian, De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, c. xxxii.
[2] Irenæus, I. c. xxiii. § 1.
[3] I. c. xxi. §§ 1, 2, 3.
[4] I. c. xxiii. § 5.
[5] c. xiii. § 2.
[6] c. i. § 2; c. iii. § 5.
[7] c. vii. § 2.

substantial fact can admit of none: heresies begun by Simon Magus, the founder, as he is ever represented to be, of Gnostic doctrines, which prevailed so widely over Christendom[1]; pursued successively by Menander[2]; Saturninus[3]; Basilides[4]; Carpocrates[5]; Cerinthus[6]; the Ebionites[7]; the Nicolaitans[8]; Cerdon[9]; Marcion[10]; Tatian with his Ἐγκρατεῖς or Continents[11]; and consolidated and reduced to a system by Valentinus[12]; against whom, as the champion of the whole, the Fathers level their chief attacks.[13] I have given a short pedigree of heresy, in order to show how very soon after the publication of the Gospel, it became active; and how sure, therefore, it was to draw to itself the attention of the Apostolic writers. "Fabulas . . . . quas Apostoli spiritus, his jam tunc pullulantibus seminibus hæreticis, damnare prævenit," as Tertullian expresses it[14]; "Fables which the spirit of the Apostle (for the germs of these heresies were even then beginning to sprout), condemned by anticipation."

Thus take the opening of the Gospel of St. John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God." But the Gnostic theory was that the Word was not "in the beginning," but was an Æon, one of a succession of beings, which originated from Bythus, the primeval God of all—was not "with God," for according to that, he did not even fully know God—was not "God," for he was produced by him, and there was a time when he was not; hence St. John's repetition of the assertion, "the same was in the beginning with God." Again, "All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made." But the Gnostic creed was that all things were made by Demiurgus, an Æon far lower in the scale than even the Word. "In him was life." But Life or Ζωὴ in the Gnostic genealogy was the mate of the Word, not itself the Word; the two being one of the earliest Æonic couples or syzygies. "And the life was the light of men." But the Gnostic would have the Light to be a substance which Achamoth attempted to grasp in vain, being hindered by Horus.[15]

[1] Irenæus, I. c. xxiii. § 4.
[2] § 5.
[3] c. xxiv. § 1.
[4] § 3.
[5] c. xxv. § 1.
[6] c. xxvi. § 1.
[7] § 2.
[8] § 3.
[9] § 1.
[10] § 2.
[11] c. xxviii. § 1.
[12] c. xxxi. § 3.
[13] IV. Præf. § 2.
[14] Tertullian, Adversus Valentinianos, c. iii.
[15] Irenæus, I. c. iv. § 1.

I simply touch on these features of the Gnostic hypothesis in order to turn your thoughts to a further investigation of the relation between that hypothesis and the Gospel of St. John; and to apprize you of the quarter to which you must direct your attention in order to develope much of the mystical language which prevails in the opening of that Gospel.

Or take the first Epistle of the same Apostle; and observe how obscure is the following phraseology, when considered without any reference to the peculiar condition of the religious world at the time; and how strongly it shows the need there is for commentators on the Epistles to make themselves acquainted with primitive ecclesiastical history. "Who is a liar, but he that denieth that *Jesus* is the Christ?"[1] "Whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of *God*, God dwelleth in him, and he in God."[2] "Whosoever believeth that *Jesus* is the Christ is born of God."[3] But if we recollect that in the earliest intimations we have of the doctrines of the Gnostics, we find those heretics making a separation between *Jesus* and *Christ*; affirming the former to be a mere man, the latter to be a superior being which entered him by an illapse at his Baptism, and quitted him before his death; we may well believe that the same or similar sentiments prevailed even in St. John's own time, and were probably the sentiments which called forth from him these emphatic declarations of the unity of the Godhead and the Manhood in one Jesus Christ.[4]

Again, in the Epistles of St. Paul there should seem to be still more allusions to this Gnostic heresy, so amply developed by the Fathers, but of which we at present know nothing except through them. Irenæus constantly speaks in a manner which shows that he entertained no doubt whatever, that St. Paul had the Gnostic in his mind when he offers so many cautions against the search after spurious knowledge. Thus, as one instance out of many. "It is better," says Irenæus, "that men should continue ignorant and unlearned, and yet by reason of charity be near to God, than have the appearance of being learned and skilful, and yet be found blasphemers of their Lord, by fashioning for themselves another God the Father. And therefore Paul exclaimed, 'knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth;' not that he would blame a

[1] 1 John ii. 22. [2] iv. 15. [3] v. 1. [4] Irenæus, III. c. xvi.

real knowledge concerning God, for in that case he would be his own accuser; but that he knew some persons who under a pretence of knowledge were puffed up so as to fall from the love of God; and thus to imagine themselves to be perfect, whilst they were introducing an imperfect Demiurgus; therefore, the Apostle, with a view to abate their pride about knowledge of this sort, says, 'knowledge puffeth up, but charity edifieth.'"[1] I bring forward this passage simply to show, that Irenæus made no question whatever of St. Paul having the Gnostics in his eye, in many of his observations in his Epistles; and to prove it is not merely a fancy of modern times that we may find the key to much of the Apostle's meaning in the sentiments of these heretics. Thus in the first Epistle to Timothy, St. Paul uses the following language,[2] "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding profane and vain babblings, and *oppositions of science falsely so called*, which some professing have erred concerning the faith." This is a passage, which amongst others Irenæus recognises as referring to this Gnostic heresy. He adopts the terms of it indeed for the title of his work, as the preface to his fifth book indicates. "In hoc libro quinto operis universi quod est de traductione et eversione *falsò cognominatæ agnitionis*." And surely nobody can read the strange speculations of the Gnostics, their Pleromas and their Æons, having no foundation in facts, and dethroning both God and Christ, without admitting that they could not be more aptly described than "as profane and vain babblings;" or remark the antagonistic principles of which their scheme is full, Light and Darkness, God and Matter, a Supreme Deity and a refractory Demiurgus; without acknowledging that the term *ἀντιθέσεις* was descriptive of its character. But if so, is it not an affair of great practical importance that the real enemy, against which the Apostle was in the first instance contending, should be thus unmasked; and that it should be no longer supposed that his argument was meant to encourage in Timothy and his successors a contempt for human learning, as many have imagined, and lead ignorant teachers to shelter their incapacity to instruct under the precepts of an Apostle?

[1] Irenæus, II. c. xxvi. § 1.

[2] *Ἀντιθέσεις τῆς ψευδωνύμου γνώσεως.*—1 Tim. vi. 20, 21.

Again, in the Epistle to Titus,[1] St. Paul cautions him to "avoid *foolish questions, and genealogies,* and contentions, and strivings about the law; for they are unprofitable," says he, "and vain. A man that is an *heretic,*" he then proceeds, "after the first and second admonition, reject:" as though there was some connection between the former and the latter clause: between the "foolish questions and genealogies" and "heresy;" which there would be, if by these foolish questions and genealogies we understand the Gnostic doctrines and the genealogies of the Æons, which form so prominent a feature of that school; for the Apostle could scarcely condemn any attention that might be paid to *Jewish* genealogies; in which sense some have understood the passage, when two of the Gospels have been careful to preserve such, and when St. Paul himself appears to have been anxious in his preaching to establish the descent of Jesus Christ from David and from Abraham.[2] The "contentions and strivings about the law" therefore which succeed to the "foolish questions and genealogies," may be very well supposed, consistently with the view I am now taking of this passage of St. Paul, to be those fables about successive emanations from God of which the Jewish Cabbala was full, and which fraternized with the dreams of the Gnostics. At any rate interpreters of St. Paul should be perfectly aware of these things, whatever weight they may attach to them; and not come to their work, the most difficult work of explaining these Epistles, and one which requires every help that can be found, unacquainted with any times but their own, and unimbued with any spirit but that of their own day.

Again, what can be the meaning, it may be asked, of St. Paul's saying to Timothy,[3] "And their word will eat as doth a canker, of whom is Hymenæus and Philetus; who concerning the truth have erred, saying that the *resurrection is past already:* and overthrow the faith of some?" Possibly this passage also is to be explained by taking into account a tenet of the Gnostics, some of whom made a resurrection to be synonymous with Baptism as administered by them, when

[1] Titus iii. 9, 10.

[2] 2 Tim. ii. 8; Acts xiii. 23; Rom. i. 3; ix. 5; Heb. vii. 13, 14. See Dr. Burton's Bampton Lectures, p. 114.

[3] 2 Tim. ii. 17, 18.

raised up from their previous state of ignorance, the parties who submitted to it became filled with knowledge, and in a certain sense died no more.[1] Indeed, Tertullian expressly affirms that St. Paul is contemplating a tenet of the Valentinians when he uses these expressions, as he is contemplating extravagancies of other sects of the Gnostic heretics when he uses other peculiar terms elsewhere. The whole paragraph is curious as proving even more conspicuously than the one I have just quoted from Irenæus, that the early Fathers regarded, as I have said, these primitive heresies, as the true key to much of the writings of the Apostles. It will be observed, it glances at some portions of those writings, which have already furnished me with examples. "Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians," says Tertullian, "takes note of those who *denied or doubted a resurrection*; an opinion proper to the Sadducees: Marcion, Apelles and Valentinus adopted it in part, and such other persons as dispute the resurrection of the flesh. In writing to the Galatians he inveighs against the observers of *circumcision and the law*: this is the heresy of Hebion. To Timothy he complains of those who *forbid marriage*: Marcion and Apelles his follower, held this tenet. He also touches those who said, that the *resurrection is already past*; such was the assertion of the Valentinians. Moreover, when he speaks of *endless genealogies*, Valentinus falls under his reprimand; whose Æon of some new name or other, and indeed several names, generates of his own Charis, Sense and Truth; these beget the Word and Life; they, Man and the Church: and such is the Ogdoad of Æons. Thence proceed ten other Æons; and from them twelve more, of strange names to make up the fable of thirty Æons. The same Apostle, when he rebukes those who are in bondage to the *elements*, points to a notion of Hermogenes, who holds that matter was not created, and compares it to God who was not created; and thus making as he does a goddess of the mother of the elements he may very well do service to her whom he likens unto God. John in the Revelation is ordered to reprove those, who ate things *offered to idols* and *committed fornication*: the Nicolaitans of that time are now the heresy of the Cainites. And

[1] Irenæus, I. c. xxiii. § 5. Origen probably alludes to the same parties. —Contra Celsum, V. § 22.

in his Epistle he calls those especially *Antichrists*, who denied that Christ had come in the flesh, and who did not think that Jesus was the Son of God: the former opinion Marcion held; the latter Hebion. But the system of sorcery of Simon, which does service to angels, and was itself counted among idolatries, was condemned by the Apostle Peter, in the person of Simon."[1] In other places Tertullian expresses the same sentiment no less confidently. In his "De Carne Christi," "When the Holy Spirit by one prophet says, 'I am God and beside me there is none other,' it looks forward to Marcion. When it exclaims in another to the same purport in the same manner, 'There was no God before me,' it hits the genealogies, as they call them, of the Æons of Valentinus. When, 'born not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God,' it replies to Hebion. When, 'Whosoever shall preach any other Gospel, even if he should be an angel from heaven, let him be accursed,' it directs its speech to the workings of the evil spirit of Apelles' virgin Philumene. When, 'he who denies that Christ is come in the flesh is antichrist,' it affirms the simple absolute quality of his flesh, in the ordinary acceptance of the term flesh, against all who cavil at it."[2]

[1] Paulus in primâ ad Corinthios notat negatores et dubitatores resurrectionis. Hæc opinio propria Sadducæorum; partem ejus usurpat Marcion, et Apelles, et Valentinus, et si qui alii resurrectionem carnis infringunt. Et ad Galatas scribens, invehitur in observatores et defensores circumcisionis et legis: Hebionis hæresis est. Timotheum instruens, nuptiarum quoque interdictores suggillat: ita instituunt Marcion et Apelles ejus secutor. Æque tangit eos, qui dicerent factam jam resurrectionem: id de se Valentiniani asseverant. Sed et cum genealogias indeterminatas nominat, Valentinus agnoscitur; apud quem Æon ille nescio qui novi et non unius nominis generat e suâ Charite Sensum et Veritatem; et hi æque procreant duos, Sermonem et Vitam; dehinc et isti generant Hominem et Ecclesiam: estque hæc prima ogdoas æonum. Exinde decem alii, et duodecim reliqui æones miris nominibus oriuntur in meram fabulam triginta æonum. Idem Apostolus, cum improbat elementis servientes, aliquid Hermogenis ostendit, qui, materiam non natam introducens, Deo non nato eam comparat, et ita matrem elementorum deam faciens, potest ei servire quam Deo comparat. Joannes vero in Apocalypsi idolothyta edentes et stupra committentes jubet castigare: sunt et nunc alii Nicolaitæ, Caiana hæresis dicitur. At in epistolâ eos maxime antichristos vocat, qui Christum negarent in carne venisse, et qui non putarent Jesum esse Filium Dei: illud Marcion, hoc Hebion vindicavit. Simonianæ autem magiæ disciplina, angelis serviens, utique et ipsa inter idololatrias deputabatur, et a Petro Apostolo in ipso Simone damnabatur.—Tertullian, De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, c. xxxiii.

[2] Ideo etiam Marcionem prospiciens: Ego sum, inquit, Deus, et alius absque me non est. Et cum in alio idipsum eodem modo dicit: Ante me Deus non fuit, nescio quas illas Valentinianorum Æonum genealogias pulsat. Et, Non ex sanguine, neque ex carnis et viri

I think these paragraphs clearly prove, that in the opinion of the early Fathers at least, the heresies of their days (which in many of their features were those of the days of the Apostles themselves more fully developed) did impress the writings of the Apostles; that they must accordingly be taken into account by those who would get at the full meaning of those writings; and that to refer them entirely to the events of comparatively modern date, as though no others suited them, is to presume a good deal. Certainly *ὕστεροι καιροὶ*, "the last times," is a phrase which relates, as it is very well known, to the times which immediately preceded the dissolution of the Jewish commonwealth, the last of that ancient kingdom. And when St. Paul tells Timothy that in those times some should come who would "forbid to marry and command to abstain from meats;"[1] and when we have it on record that these two features were characteristic of a school of the Gnostics so early as Irenæus,[2] and that the principle which prompted these restrictions was a notion that all matter was radically corrupt, and that the less it was propagated or meddled with the better; we shall at once see the force of the Apostle's remark, which immediately follows, viz. "Every creature of God is good,"[3] and the idea which was in his mind at the moment, connecting the former clause with this; his argument taking precisely the same turn as that of Irenæus, where he says, "the followers of Saturninus and Marcion, or Continents as they are called, preached *abstinence from marriage* and from *animal meats*, thus showing themselves ungrateful to *God who made all things*;"[4] and we shall feel that there is no need perhaps to go further for the solution of the passage, and that if we do so we may fare worse.[5]

voluntate, sed ex Deo natus est, Hebioni respondit. Æque, etiamsi angelus de cœlo aliter evangelizaverit vobis quam nos, anathema sit; ad energema Apelleiacæ virginis Philumenes filum dirigit. Certe, qui negat Christum in carne venisse, hic antichristus est; nudam et absolutam et simplici nomine naturæ suæ pronuntians carnem, omnes disceptatores ejus ferit.—De Carne Christi, c. xxiv.

[1] 1 Tim. iv. 1. 3.

[2] Nubere autem et generare a Satana dicunt esse. Multi autem ex iis, qui sunt ab eo, et ab animalibus abstinent, per fictam hujusmodi continentiam seducentes multos.—Irenæus, I. c. xxiv. § 2.

[3] 1 Tim. iv. 4.

[4] Ἀπὸ Σατορνίνου καὶ Μαρκίωνος οἱ καλούμενοι Ἐγκρατεῖς ἀγαμίαν ἐκήρυξαν . . . . καὶ τῶν λεγομένων παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐμψύχων ἀποχὴν εἰσηγήσαντο ἀχαριστοῦντες τῷ πάντα πεποιηκότι Θεῷ.—Irenæus, I. c. xxviii. § 1.

[5] See Dr. Burton's Bampton Lec-

It is not improbable that the very phraseology of the Apostolical Epistles has been tinged by the technical terms of the Gnostic school, and that, accordingly, some acquaintance with those terms is necessary to the full understanding of much of the language of those Epistles. Thus, "That ye may be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth and length, and depth (*βάθος*), and height, and to know the love of Christ, which passeth knowledge (*γνῶναί τε τὴν ὑπερβάλλουσαν τῆς γνώσεως ἀγάπην τοῦ* Χριστοῦ), that ye may be filled with all the fulness of God (*εἰς πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα τοῦ Θεοῦ*)."[1] Here *βάθος* akin to *βυθὸς*, *γνῶσις*, *πλήρωμα*, are all of them terms of the most common use in the Gnostic vocabulary: as if the Apostle intended to suggest that the "love of Christ," which he was endeavouring to foster in the Ephesians, would impart to them far higher and nobler thoughts than all these heretical mysteries with their *βυθὸς* or primeval God, their *γνῶσις*, or knowledge, falsely so called, and their *πλήρωμα*, or dwelling-place of their Æons. Or again, these Æons themselves seem to enter into the language of the Apostle, as when he says, "God hath spoken unto us by his Son, by whom also he made *the worlds* (*τοὺς αἰῶνας*):" as though he would imply that Christ was the Maker, not only of the universe, but of the Æons themselves; of all spiritual beings; whether they were, as he expresses it in another place,[2] "thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers."

IV.

I said that, besides developing the spirit in which the early Church interpreted the Old Testament, especially the ritual and prophetical parts of it; and besides affording a guide to much of the New Testament, by showing the opinions held by the early Church upon many leading questions since made matters of debate; and a key to much more of it by putting

tures, notes 60 and 61, and Bishop Pearson, Minor Theological Works, vol. ii. pp. 41–55. Concio IV. on 1 Tim. iv. 1. It may be here observed that Bishop Pearson, in his Vindiciæ, Pt. I. c. vi., *understands* the *ἀντίθεος πανουργία* mentioned in some verses quoted by Irenæus from a Senior quidam, I. c. xv. § 6, to mean Anti-Christ. He might have *proved* that to be the meaning by a reference to I. c. xiii. § 1, where Marcus is called *πρόδρομος τοῦ Ἀντιχρίστου*, as in the passage in question he is called *πρόδρομος ἀντιθέου πανουργίας*, Anti-Christ being identified with these early heresies.

[1] Ephes. iii. 18, 19.

[2] Col. i. 16, 17.

us in possession of the heresies which infested the Church from the most primitive times, to which the Apostles often have an eye; the Fathers were further of use by furnishing many probable expositions of individual texts. I am far from maintaining that their comments are to be received in all instances: the aptness of the comment of course will depend in a great measure on the judgment and ability of the particular commentator: but I do say that, owing to the period at which they lived; following so closely in the wake of the Apostles themselves, as they did; and cast into a social position so similar to that in which the Epistles were written; there is a freshness and spirit in much of their expositions which distinguish them very greatly from those of more modern days; and a charm in the absence of all that manipulation of the meaning, which texts undergo at the hands of schools of theology in later times. I may not be able, on the spur of the moment, to produce the happiest examples of the interpretation of texts which the Fathers supply; but such as I may offer will serve to direct the attention to the kind of assistance they often yield us in mastering Scripture.

Thus, to take a simple case: "The Lord of that servant shall come in a day when he looketh not for him, and in an hour that he is not aware of, and shall *cut him asunder* (*διχοτομήσει αὐτόν*)."[1] The term *διχοτομήσει*, as applied to the servant who had forfeited his trust, and abused his master's property in his absence, finds an illustration in Tertullian, who speaks of an obsolete Roman law, by which the bankrupt debtor was condemned to be cut asunder by his creditors.[2]

Again, John's caution to the soldiers, "Do *violence* to no man, neither *accuse any falsely*,"[3] is shown to be strictly appropriate to that class of his hearers, and in keeping with the times, by another phrase which drops from the same Father. He is enumerating the several enemies truth and the Gospel encountered. "As many as are strangers to it," says he, "are its foes: the Jews indeed naturally out of rivalry; the *soldiers ex concussione*," a legal term, implying extortion by threats or violence.[4]

[1] Matt. xxiv. 51.

[2] Sed et judicatos retro in partes secari a creditoribus leges erant.—Tertullian, Apol. c. iv.

[3] Luke iii. 14.

[4] Tertullian, Apol. c. vii.

Again, "and they sent unto him their disciples *with the Herodians*," to put the insidious question to Jesus about the tribute money.[1] Tertullian tells us[2] (though not in reference to this text) that the Herodians were persons who believed Herod to be the Christ. If so, the selection of these men by the Pharisees for their malicious errand was peculiarly well suited to the end they had in view.

Once more, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the works that I do shall he do also; and *greater works than these shall he do; because I go unto my Father.*"[3] Thus the disciples were to do greater works than Jesus himself had done, prodigious as were his miracles. How so? Origen, no doubt, gives the true solution; that the spiritual wonders which the disciples would be able to effect on the souls of mankind, after the Comforter should have come, would exceed in dignity the physical ones of the Saviour himself. "I would venture to say that, according to the promise of Jesus, the disciples have done greater things than those sensible ones which Jesus did: for the eyes of the blind in soul are constantly opened; and the ears of those who have been deaf to the accents of virtue, listen eagerly to instruction concerning God and a blessed life with him; and many who were lame in the gait of their 'inner man,' as Scripture terms it, now that the Word hath healed them, not only leap, but leap as a stag, an animal hostile to serpents, and superior to all the poison of vipers; and cured of their former halting, they receive from Jesus authority to trample under their feet —those very feet which were infirm before—the malice of snakes and scorpions, and, in a word, all the power of the enemy, without injury to themselves."[4]

Again, "For this cause ought the woman to have power (or a covering) on her head, because of the angels."[5] Modern interpreters of this text have resorted to various explanations of the term "angels," in order, apparently, to evade the literal one; the Romish abuse of worshipping angels having, as it should seem, excited a prejudice against acknowledging their

[1] Matt. xxii. 16.

[2] Prætermitto Pharisæos, qui additamenta quædam legi adstruendo a Judæis divisi sunt: unde etiam hoc accipere ipsum quod habent nomen, digni fuerunt: cum hic etiam Herodianos, qui Christum Herodem esse dixerunt. —De Præscriptione Hæreticorum, c. xlv.

[3] John xiv. 12.

[4] Origen, Contra Celsum, II. § 48.

[5] 1 Cor. xi. 10.

reasonable presence about men, and their legitimate offices. But the Fathers in general take the text in its strict sense, for the most part evidently unconscious that it would admit of any other, and regard the angels as invisible partakers in the congregations of the faithful [1]; present at their prayers [2]; ministers at their Baptism [3]; witnesses of their marriage [4]; and, accordingly, the admonition in the Marriage Service of the Salisbury Ritual runs thus: "Dearly beloved, we are gathered together here in the sight of God, of the angels, and all his saints, in the face of the congregation," &c.; some such form having no doubt existed from the earliest times.

Take one instance more. Few questions relating to the New Testament history have given rise to more intricate controversy than the amount of power left with the Jewish magistrates under the Roman government; whether it extended to the infliction of capital punishment or not. Lardner, in his "Credibility of the Gospel History," at great length denies it.[5] Mr. Biscoe, in his "History of the Acts of the Apostles," at no less length maintains it.[6] The texts introduced into the discussion are thoroughly conflicting. Thus we read on the one hand of Saul going with letters from the High Priest to Damascus, and on that authority prepared to bring men and women, who were Christians, bound to Jerusalem: of his "breathing out threatenings and slaughter:" [7] of his "persecuting that way unto the death." [8] We read of Tertullus saying concerning Paul, "Whom we took, and would have judged according to our law. But the chief captain Lysias came upon us, and with great violence took him out of our hands." [9] And we read of the Jews declaring, "We never were in bondage to any man." [10] On the other hand, we have these same Jews, when Pilate bid them "take Jesus and judge him according to their law," replying, "it

[1] Irenæus, I. c. viii. § 2. Origen, De Oratione, § 31. Theophylact, it is true, refers to an opinion of Clemens that they were *τοὺς τῆς Ἐκκλησίας δικαίους*, but he pronounces it to be too refined a notion.

[2] Angelo adhuc orationis adstante.—Tertullian, De Oratione, c. xvi.

[3] Sed in aquâ emundati sub angelo, Spiritui Sancto præparamur.—De Baptismo, c. vi.

[4] Unde sufficiamus ad enarrandam felicitatem ejus matrimonii, quod Ecclesia conciliat, et confirmat oblatio, et obsignat benedictio, *angeli renuntiant*, Pater rato habet?—Ad Uxorem, II. c. ix.

[5] Lardner, Credibility, Pt. I. Bk. I. c. ii.

[6] Biscoe on the Acts, ch. vi.

[7] Acts ix. 1, 2.

[8] Acts xxii. 4.

[9] Acts xxiv. 6, 7.

[10] John viii. 33.

is not lawful for us to put any man to death."[1] The circumstances attending the death of Stephen are a practical example of the difficulty of coming to a conclusion on the one side or the other; some of the incidents seeming to indicate that the proceeding was a legal one; others, that it was a violent and tumultuous one; and all of them taken together perhaps arguing that it was a mixture of both. And, accordingly, our Church historians are at a loss what view to give of this transaction. Now there is a passage in Origen's Epistle to Africanus, which I have not seen noticed by any of the disputants, that appears to me to furnish a clue to the whole question. In this Epistle, Origen is undertaking a sort of hasty defence (for he professes that he was not at the time in a condition to examine the matter with care) of the genuineness of the History of Susanna: and one of the objections to its genuineness urged by his friend being this, "How could they who were in captivity pass a sentence of death" (for sentence of death was passed on the elders[2])? Origen makes answer, "It is no extraordinary thing, when great nations have been conquered, for the victorious sovereign to allow his captives to make use of their own laws and courts. At this moment," he then adds, "under the empire of the Romans, to whom the Jews are tributary, we know from our own experience what power the Ethnarch is permitted by Cæsar to exercise over them, so that he differs nothing from their king. And they have their trials according to law *by stealth*; and some are even *condemned to death*: all this not done, to be sure, with perfect boldness; *but still with the connivance of the Emperor*. Now this we can speak to with confidence, having been ourselves long living in the country of this people. And yet only two tribes, those of Judah and Benjamin, and perhaps that of Levi, are reported to have come under the rule of the Romans: whereas the Israelites consisted of ten other tribes besides Judah; and it is probable the Assyrians were satisfied with having them captives, and let them retain their own courts."[3] The Jews, therefore, it should seem from Origen's account, who speaks like one intimately acquainted with the facts of the case, were and were not in the enjoyment of their own laws, and their own tribunals. Their

[1] John xviii. 31.
[2] History of Susanna, v. 62.
[3] Origen, Epist. ad Africanum, § 14.

magistrates acted, but still under sufferance: the Romans at any moment ready to declare their own supreme authority, and suspend their functions. A position like this explains the equivocal language we find used on the subject; as well as the indecent haste with which the Jew sometimes hurried on the consummation of his own decree. And a phrase in Justin confirms the information furnished by Origen. For in his "Dialogue with Trypho," when applying a reproachful passage of Isaiah to the Jews, against whom that treatise is directed, "And truly," says he, "your hand is lifted up to do evil" (as the prophet had described), "since even when ye had slain Christ, ye do not repent, but hate and *murder* us, who through him believe in the God and Father of the universe, *as often as ye receive the power*."[1]

Who can deny that authors who enable us to clear up obscurities of this kind are of great value? or fail to see that it is their early date, and that alone, which very often qualifies them for doing this; and that no substitute or equivalent can be found for that advantage in commentators of modern days, let their sagacity and other accomplishments be what they may?

[1] Ὁσάκις αν λάβητε ἐξουσίαν.—Justin Martyr, Dial. § 133.

PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE

EXPLAINED OR REFERRED TO.

	PAGE
Genesis i. 14	506
i. 20	434
i. 21, 22	429
i. 24	430
i. 26	130, 400, 430
i. 28	154
xviii. 17	130
xix. 24	130, 174, n.
xix. 30–38	171
xxxvii. 19	320
xlix. 10	226
Exodus iii. 14	130
xvii. 16	231
Leviticus x. 1-3	143
xvi. 13, 14	458
Numbers xvi.	143
Deuteronomy i. 31	90
iv. 19	212
xxxiii. 17	221
Joshua i. 8	113
Judges vi. 37–40	498
1 Samuel vi. 14	171
2 Kings iv. 34, 35	503
Job xiv. 4, 5	477
Psalms ii. 2	387
ii. 8	224
iii. 5	387
xix. 4	221
xix. 5	230, 387
xxii.	362
xxii. 9	387
xxii. 14	387
xxii. 21	387
xxiv. 7	387
xxvii. 1	387
xlv. 2	388
li. 5	478, 479
lviii. 3	479
lxxii	388
lxxii. 8	226
xcix. 1	291
cvii. 20	388
cix. 1	387
cix. 16	505
cx. 3	387
cxv. 3	400
Proverbs ii. 5	460
viii. 22	409
viii. 23	130
Proverbs ix. 1	85, 457
ix. 17	452
Isaiah i. 22	77
ix. 6	386
xliii. 10	514
xlv. 5	514
liii.	389
liii. 5	417
lxi. 2	175
Ezekiel ii. 8	461
Malachi i. 11	446, 448, 450
St. Matthew i. 1	360, 367
i. 17	369, 370
i. 18	367
i. 20, 21	367
ii. 11, 12	172
iv. 19	29
v. 26	83
vi. 10	491
vi. 11	87
vi. 33	501
vii. 6	133
x. 1	323
x. 8	323
x. 16	210
x. 23	339
x. 34	208
x. 34, 35, 36	302
xiii. 15	499
xiii. 31, 32	221
xv. 3	77
xv. 6	110
xv. 13	502
xvi. 23	192
xvi. 19	83
xviii. 3	431
xix. 12	196
xix. 21	488
xix. 27	244
xxii. 16	518
xxii. 21	475
xxii. 29, 32	392
xxiii. 9	431
xxiii. 33	501
xxiv. 14	225
xxiv. 19	197
xxiv. 51	517
xxvi. 28	458
xxvi. 52	203

	PAGE
St. Matthew xxvii. 52, 53	370
xxviii. 20	113, 434
St. Mark i. 1	360
ii. 26	185
iii. 13, 14, 15	324
vi. 3	361
vi. 12, 13	324
x. 14	440
x. 39	191
xvi. 15–18	324
xvi. 18	298
St. Luke i. 1–4	53, 54
i. 5	360
iii. 14	517
viii. 13	505
viii. 51	361
ix. 62	504
x. 9	324
x. 18	485
x. 19	298
x. 17	324
x. 35	486
xxi. 12	301
xxii. 19	14, 15
xxiv. 25	392
St. John i. 1	360, 509
i. 2	509
i. 3	398, 509
i. 4	509
i. 13	514
i. 17	459
ii. 4	73
ii. 13, 23	360
iii. 5	476
iv. 7, 46	360
iv. 24	459
v. 1	360
v. 39	90
vi. 33	460
vi. 35, 48, 51	453
vi. 48	456
vi. 51	463, 464
vi. 54	147
vi. 63	456
vi. 67	469
viii. 33	519
viii. 57	175
x. 30	371
xi. 54	189
xi. 55, 56	236
xii. 1	360
xiii. 10	497
xiv. 6	114, 149
xiv. 12	492, 518
xvi. 12	491
xvi. 13	393
xvi. 14	371
St. John xvi. 33	211
xviii. 31	520
xxi. 25	53
Acts i. 3	329
ii. 17	327
iv. 24	363
v. 16	325
vi.	330
vi. 6	327
vi. 8	327
vii. 55	327
viii. 6	327
viii. 7, 8	325
viii. 20	491
ix. 1, 2	519
ix. 3–6	327
x. 3	327
x. 10–12	326
x. 46	325
xiii. 23	512
xiv. 23	330
xv. 2–4	331
xv. 28	409
xvi. 9	327
xvii. 6	236
xviii. 9	327
xix. 6	325
xix. 12	325
xix. 13	322
xix. 24–27	291
xx. 17	254, 335
xx. 25	335
xx. 28	335, 375
xx. 35	53
xxi. 13	192
xxii. 4	519
xxiii. 11	327
xxiv. 6, 7	519
xxiv. 26	256
xxvii. 23, 24	327
xxvii. 38	185
xxviii. 5	298
xxviii. 16	232
Romans i. 3	512
vii. 15–23	473
vii. 25	381
ix. 5	375, 379, 512
ix. 21	506
1 Corinthians i. 24	468
i. 27	95
ii. 4	493
ii. 6	91
ii. 12	494
iii. 2	93, 147
iii. 7	493
v. 4	374
v. 9	353

	PAGE
1 Corinthians v. 9, 10	199
vi. 1	234, 308
vi. 5, 6	308
vii.	304
vii. 8	120
vii. 12, 13	234
vii. 20	202
vii. 25	196
vii. 29	154
viii. 1	511
x. 9	381
xi. 10	518
xiv. 15	494
xiv.	325
xv. 3	422
xv. 12	513
xv. 29	155
xv. 50	171
xvi. 8, 19	374
2 Corinthians ii. 15	460
iii. 13, 16	391
Galatians i. 8	514
iv. 3, 9	513
iv. 21	513
vi. 7	115
vi. 12	513
Ephesians i. 1	355
i. 13, 14	393
iii. 18, 19	516
iii. 21	30
iv. 6	394
iv. 30	490
Philippians i. 12–18	234, 235
ii. 10	250
iv. 22	232
Colossians i. 16, 17	516
iv. 6	90
iv. 16	354
2 Thessalonians ii. 2	351
iii. 17.	351
1 Timothy i. 4	184, 513
ii. 9	247
iii. 3.	266
iii. 12	330
iii. 16	375, n.
iv. 1, 3	515
iv. 3	513
1 Timothy iv. 4	515
v. 1, 17	331
v. 18	391
v. 22	331
vi. 20, 21	511
2 Timothy ii. 8	512
ii. 9	232
ii. 17, 18	512, 513
ii. 21	506
iv. 6	232
Titus iii. 9, 10	512
Philemon 10	350
Hebrews i. 2	358
v. 4, 5, 6	443
vi. 1, 2	259, 260
vi. 4, 6	359
vi. 11	356
vi. 20	356
vi. 26, 27	443
vii. 13, 14	512
ix. 19	391
xi. 1	356
xi. 26	420
xi. 37	356
1 Peter iii. 3, 4	247
iii. 15	90
2 Peter i. 4	437
i. 19	349
1 John i. 1	460
ii. 19	469
ii. 22	510
ii. 23	381
iv. 3	514
iv. 15	510
v. 1	510
v. 7	371, 372, 375, n.
Jude 3	178
Revelation ii. 1, 8	331
ii. 10	191
ii. 14	513
iv. 4	337
vi. 9	191
vii. 4	347
x. 10	461
xiii. 18	74, 85, 365
xviii. 5	381

INDEX.

Abgarus, King of Edessa, the spurious letter of, 230.

Absolution, language of Cyprian on, 115; how often, and on what terms conceded, 262.

Acts of Cyrenius, 48; of Pilate, ibid.

Acts of Peter, 51, 54, 56.

Acts of the Apostles, testimony of the Fathers to the Canonical authority of the, 347; the substance the same in their time as it is now, 362.

Alexandria, condition of Christianity at, 229; influence of its schools, ibid.

Allegory, the use of, objected against the Fathers by Daillé, 169; unquestionably a prominent feature in primitive theology, 170; Origen the first of the Fathers who refines away the fact in it, 172; observation of Dr. Waterland, 174.

Altar, use of the word by Origen, 191; by Irenæus, 450; by Tertullian, 455; by Cyprian, 463.

ἀνατολή, a name of Christ, 458.

Andrew, St., 231.

Angels, worship of the, not favoured by the Fathers, 69, 75, 84, 97; believed by them to be present in Christian congregations, 519.

Anicetus, tolerated the observance of Easter at an uncanonical time, 156.

Antichrist, conjecture with respect to the name of, 74, 85; inconsistency of Tertullian respecting, 155.

Antiquity, the English Reformation characterized by reverence for, 4, 15; causes acting to the disparagement of, 15–19; its value maintained by Dr. Waterland, 178, 179; subjects on which the Church of England appeals to it, 180, 181; jealousy of reference to it explained, 213, 214.

Antoninus Pius confirmed the edict of Hadrian, 277, 282.

Arians, the, made use of unguarded expressions of the Fathers, 131.

Aristides, addressed his Apology to Hadrian, 281.

Aristobulus, a commentator on the books of Moses, quoted by Clemens, 49, 172.

Arms, the profession of, why objected to by Tertullian, 204, 205.

Articles, the thirty-nine, correspond with the writings of the Primitive Church, 5.

Article, the sixth, does not exclude the appeal to antiquity, 178, 346.

Assurance, the language of Tertullian is repugnant to the Calvinistic doctrine of, 500, 501.

Athenagoras replies to the charge of atheism, 44; a passage of his the counterpart of one in Justin, 70; disallowed second marriages, 195; to whom his treatise on the resurrection was addressed, 248; bears testimony to the activity of persecution in his time, 282; and to the domestic troubles of the Christians, 304; his sentiments on the Trinity, 402; on the effects of the Fall, 471; on inspiration, 484.

Atonement, testimony of Barnabas to the, 417, 421; of Clemens Romanus, 417; of Ignatius, ibid.; of Justin Martyr, ibid.; of Irenæus, 418; of Melito, 419; of Clemens Alexandrinus, 419–421; of Tertullian, 421, 422; of Hippolytus, 422; of Origen, 423, 424; of Cyprian, 425.

Auditores, 259, 441.

Aurelius, the edict of Trajan in force under, 277, 279; several Apologies put forth in the reign of, 282, 292.

Autographs of the Apostles, many understand Tertullian to speak of the, 352.

Baptism, particulars relating to the administration of, 31, 134; language of the Fathers respecting, 124; must be in the name of the Trinity, 398; Regeneration in, denied by the Socinians, 427; asserted by Hermas, ibid.; by Justin Martyr, 428; by Irenæus, 428, 429; by Theophilus, 429; by Clemens Alexandrinus, 430–

432; by Tertullian, 432–436; by Origen, 436; by Hippolytus, 437; by Cyprian, 438, 439; the efficacy of it not ascribed to the *opus operatum*, 440; probation of Candidates, 259, 260, 441; sponsors required, 260, 440; confessions, promises, and renunciations made in, 259, 441, 442; the benefit contingent on the observance of the vow, 442; strictness of the early Church on the obligations of, 443, 444; why the delay of it was recommended by Tertullian, 476.

Baptism, heretical, Cyprian differed from Stephanus on, 38.

Baptism of Infants, evidence for the, in Clemens Alexandrinus, 29, 440; in Justin Martyr, 71, 440; in Cyprian, 440; in the Apostolical Constitutions, ibid.

Barbeyrac, Jean, origin of his treatise "on the Morality of the Fathers," 182; took his information at second-hand, 185, 201; not conversant with Justin Martyr or Clemens Alexandrius, 183, 184; does not allow for circumstances which ought to be considered in reading the Fathers, 185, 186, 196, 197, 201, 213; some of his objections have no relation to morality, 186; charges the Fathers with encouraging the Christians to volunteer martyrdom, ibid.; with disparaging marriage, especially second, 195; with denouncing certain trades, 201; the profession of arms, 203; heathen customs, 205; offices of state, 206; regards their morality faulty on self-preservation, 210; imputes to Clemens Alexandrinus the justification of idolatry among the Pagans, 211.

Barnabas, the Epistle of, considered fictitious by Daillé, 56; defended by Vossius, Hammond, &c., 58; we have most of it both in Greek and Latin, 68; contains strong language on the corruption of man, 153; is full of allegory, 170, 171; bears testimony to the Atonement, 417, 421; the effect of the Fall, 470, 477; the doctrine of spiritual influence, 482.

Bartholomew, St., 230, 231, note.

Basil, remarks on the strength of tradition in controlling private speculation, 396.

Beveridge, William, Bishop of St. Asaph, shows that the Articles correspond with the writings of the Primitive Church, 6; defended and made use of the Fathers, 122.

Beza, the bias of his Translation Calvinistic, 466.

Bishops, how maintained in the Primitive Church, 250; amount of their salaries, 251; their frequent journeys, 252, 253; admonished not to be too hasty in excommunicating, 263, 264; their succession in the Church of Rome, 334. *See* Episcopacy.

Bull, George, Bishop of St. David's, his method of accounting for the Sibylline verses, 49; defends the Shepherd of Hermas, 58; produced a passage in Irenæus which refers to the Epistles of Ignatius, 60; discusses a passage in Justin Martyr claimed by the Romanists, 69, 183; upholds the authority of the Primitive Fathers against Petavius, Zuicker, and Sandius, 102, 179; his opinion on the treatise "De Consummatione Mundi" ascribed to Hippolytus, 438, note; quotes the language of Socrates on sin after Baptism, 443.

Burial Service, in what sense the word 'elect' is used in the, 497.

Burton, Dr. Edward, his remarks on the various readings in Acts xx. 28, 375; gives instances of loose translation in the Latin version of Irenæus, 378.

Βυθός, 516.

Calvin, admired by Philpot, 10; and by Grindal, 13; the early Fathers unanimous against his leading doctrines, 466, 469, 471, 479, 481, 495, 503, 504, 506.

Cambridge, the University of, makes the Fathers an element of Theological examination, 4.

Canon of Scripture, the, a subject of discussion at the early Provincial Councils, 254; use of the Fathers in establishing it, 346–351.

Casaubon, Isaac, his remark on the English Reformation, 4.

καταγγέλλω, 235.

κατήχησις, 259.

Catechumens, admission to the class of, 259, 441; nature of the instruction imparted to, ibid.

Catholic, Philpot questioned on the meaning of the word, 11.

Celibacy, vows of, a passage opposed to them in Justin Martyr, 71; another

in Irenæus, 75; origin of them in Tertullian, 82; yet their necessity denied, 84; the Clergy not under them in the time of Origen, 96.
Celsus, remarks on Origen's treatise against, 100, 411; was an Epicurean, 240, note; objections of his answered by Origen, 88, *et seq.*, 239, 240, 258, 261, 280, 285, 423, 424, 479; some of them have reference to the Divinity of Christ, 410.
κηρύσσω, 235.
Chalcedon, conduct of Paschasinus at the Council of, 103.
Cherubim, the, were considered by Irenæus characteristic of the four Gospels, 359, 360.
Chillingworth, William, effect of Daillé's treatise on, 20.
Christ, the remembrance of the Cross is precious to all who rightly believe in, 8; how his meaning in saying, "This is my Body," is to be ascertained, 13, 14; some expressions of the Fathers respecting him liable to misconstruction, 151, 152; they interpreted the Old Testament with reference to him, 384–386; especially the Psalms, 386–388; testimonies to the unity of his Person, 73, 367, 399; to his Divine Nature, 61, 67, 89, 129, 131, 377–380, 393–395, 400–405, 410, 412; to his Incarnation, 406–408, 412. *See* Atonement.
Christianity, use of the Fathers in relation to the evidences of, 220; their testimony to its wide dispersion in their time, 220–230; secret progress of it, 231–233; its disturbing effect on the relations of society instrumental to its propagation, 234, 235; its progress assisted by the resort of people to the games, 236, 237; a capital offence from the time of Nero downwards, 278; entailed domestic troubles on those who professed it, 301–305; pecuniary losses, 306; and other embarrassments, 308.
Church, the Catholic, its peace and unity not broken by difference of customs, 114, 157; definition of it as understood by the Fathers, 330.
Church, the Primitive, appealed to in the Articles, 5, 6; in the Canons, 7; by Jewel, 8; by Philpot, 10, 11; by Grindal, 14; the writings of the early Fathers acquaint us with its doctrines and discipline, 24, 28; adopted the allegorical method of interpreting Scripture, 170, 173; insisted on the previous probation of candidates for Baptism, 259; treated the lapse of her members with severity, 261; did not easily receive them again, 262; inflicted excommunication without calculating its effect on her numerical strength, 263; used precautions against mercenary converts, 265–268; its nature and construction, as represented in the Acts and Epistles filled up by the Fathers, 329; its Creed Trinitarian, 393, 394, 395.
Church of England, the, refers her members to the Fathers, 4, 5, 346; explains the principle of her Prayer Book, 4; suggests the method of dealing with the Romanists, 8; effect of the Revolution on, 18; occupies the same ground as the Primitive Church on tradition, 78; her discretion in the use of the Fathers, 180, 181; concurs with them in their application of the Psalms to Jesus Christ, 388.
Church of Rome, followeth not the Primitive, 10, 11: a passage of Irenæus supposed favourable to the, 37, 71; traces of its characteristics and pretensions in Tertullian, 82, 83. *See* Romanist.
Churches, independence of, claimed by Cyprian, 111.
Churches, of Ephesus, Smyrna, and Rome, appealed to by Irenæus, 77, 78.
Cicero, incident in the life of, 289.
Clarendon, Lord, a remark of, 20.
Clemens Alexandrinus, account of his writings, 29, 135, 244, 249; use of them illustrated, 29; profuse in his references, 53; justified in quoting the Apocryphal Gospels, 53–56; discussion of four passages supposed favourable to Purgatory, 80; his language opposed to Transubstantiation, 81, 147, 454; the germ of future abuses may be traced in his writings, 81; some of his peculiarities accounted for, 136, 137; charged by Daillé with disingenuousness, 146; some passages of his liable to misconstruction, 148; instances of conflicting language, 153; ignorance of Hebrew, 167; excessive use of allegory, 172; his doctrinal errors not of a kind to invalidate his testimony,

175; his language moderate on martyrdom, 187, 188; his justifying heathen idolatry explained, 211, 212; his writings exhibit the state of Christianity at Alexandria, 229; and the activity of persecution there, 283; addressed himself to the upper and educated classes, 244, 249; relates the restoration of a lapsed youth by St. John, 258; mentions precautions taken against mercenary converts, 265; advises on domestic troubles arising from the profession of Christianity, 303; alludes to the continuance of miraculous power, 316, 317; is not concerned with ecclesiastical questions, yet intimates the three Orders, 336, 337; his testimony to the Canonical books of the New Testament, 51, 52, 347, 351; and to the Epistle to the Hebrews being St. Paul's, 355, 356; quotes the genealogy in St. Matthew and his account of the Conception, 361, 369; confirms the received reading in Acts xx. 28, 376; his testimony to the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, 401; to the Atonement, 419–421; to regeneration in Baptism, 430–432; to Infant Baptism, 29, 440; to the obligations of Baptism, 441; his sentiments on the Eucharist, 81, 452–454, 464; on the freedom of the will, 467, 468; on the corruption of our nature, 152, 476; on the doctrine of grace, 29, 486–488, 496; his use of the term elect, 500, 501.

Clemens Romanus writes in the name of the Church of Rome, 37, 161; his Epistle commended by Eusebius, 160; describes the extent of St. Paul's travels, 221; distinguishes between clergy and laity, 252; probably refers to miraculous gifts, 310; intimates three orders, 331; what he meant by ἐπὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς, 344; refers to the Epistle to the Hebrews, 355; his interpretation of the purple thread, 386; his testimony to the Trinity, 393; to the Atonement, 417; applies προσφορὰ to the Eucharist, 446; held the doctrine of spiritual influence, 482.

Clergy, how maintained in the Primitive Church, 250; their number greater in proportion to that of the people than at present, 251; were devoted exclusively to the work of the ministry, 252.

Commodus, the rescript of Hadrian acted on in the reign of, 277.

Communion, the Holy, a set form of service for in the early Church, 31; administered in both kinds, 70, 74. *See* Eucharist.

Confession, auricular, evidence against the necessity of, 41–43; germ of it, 81.

Confession, public, a part of the primitive discipline, 41–43; proceedings connected with, 262.

Constitutions, the Apostolical, not mentioned by Daillé, 26; their date, ibid.; and use, 267; contain rules concerning orphans, 198, 255, 271; sponsors in Baptism, 260; Baptism of infants, 440; the duties of a Bishop, 263; the distribution of alms, 267, 268.

Convocation, abeyance of, 19.

Cornelius, Bishop of Rome, language of Cyprian towards, 111; speaks moderately on absolution, 115; his letter to Fabius quoted by Eusebius, 334.

Corruption of human nature, the Fathers at variance with themselves on the degree of the, 152, 153, 469, *et seqq.*

Councils, General, appealed to by Philpot, 11; were subsequent to the early Fathers, 162.

Councils, not amounting to General, frequent in the early Church, 253.

Creed, the Athanasian, compared with the language of the early Fathers, 397–408.

Creed, the primitive, given by Tertullian, 157, 491; his remarks on, 157, 490.

Creeds, definite, 15; the form in which tradition bears witness to doctrine, 79.

Cross, the use of it in Baptism defended by an appeal to the Fathers, 7; the early Christians were accused of worshipping it, 44; custom of signing the forehead with, 32; abuse of it, 82.

Custom and Verity, Grindal's Dialogue between, 13.

Custom, distinguished from Apostolical tradition, 113, 114

Cyprian, use of his letters in modern controversies, 32, 34, 38, 42; his "De Unitate Ecclesiæ" interpolated, 105; other omissions and alterations have

been corrected, 108; evidence against the Romanists in his writings, 109–119; germ of Romish errors discoverable in them, 119–121; alludes to, but does not insist on Infant Communion, 158; his sentiments on martyrdom, 189, 190, 191, 193; on patience, 210, 211; his testimony to the progress of Christianity in his time, 226, 228, 230; and to the rank of the Christians, 246; furnishes information on the maintenance of the clergy, 250; and the organization of the early Church, 254; regulates the application of Church funds, 255, 266; denounces the buying off persecution, 256; instances of the administration of Church discipline by him, 262, 265, 267, 306; records an incident respecting a deserted child, 271; his martyrdom under Valerian, 284; circumstances of it, 294–296; details of persecution in his time, 300; visions related by him, 320; his testimony on the Apostolical succession, 330; on Episcopacy, 342; on Baptism in the name of the Trinity, 397; on the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, ibid.; on the Atonement, 425; on Baptismal Regeneration, 438; on Infant Baptism, 440; his language on the Eucharist, 461–464; he insists on fear and reverence in coming to it, 465; his views on the freedom of the will, 469; on the Fall, 479; on the necessity of Divine Grace, 491, 492; on the offer of grace and salvation to all, 502; at variance with those of Calvin, 503.

Daillé, no book has contributed more to depreciate the Fathers than his treatise on the right use of them, 20; its republication, 40; he divides into two heads, 22; i. That the testimony of the Fathers is obscure and uncertain, ibid.; exaggerates the paucity of early writings, 22, 23; gives an imperfect account of their contents, 27, 28, 30; represents the Fathers to be of no use in modern controversies, 27, 32, 36, 37; depreciates them on the suspicion of forgery and interpolation, 46; charges them with quoting apocryphal books, 48, 50, 56; account of his argument against the epistles of Ignatius, 58–65; exaggerates the difficulty of ascertaining the text of the early Fathers, 66; charges the Romanists with mutilation of them, 67, 102; adduces a case of fraud attempted by Paschasinus, 103; Cyprian, the first Father against whom the charge is distinctly maintained, 105, 108; objects that the Fathers are obscure, 127, from their writing before controversies arose, 128, 129, 132; from design, 132; from the peculiarity of their style, 137, 140; from the change in the meaning of words, 143; charges them with disingenuousness, 146; illogical reasoning, 150; changes of opinion, 152; confounding the importance of things, 156; questions whether their opinions were those of their Churches, 159; or of the universal Church, 161; ii. That the testimony of the Fathers is not of authority to decide modern controversies, 22, 164; charges them with inaccuracy, 165, 166; ignorance of Hebrew, 167; heedless use of allegory, 169; doctrinal errors, 174; disagreement with each other, 176; contends that neither Romanists nor Protestants acknowledge them as umpires, 178; his motives, 58, 87, 102, 123, 142, 179.

Dan, the tribe of, why omitted from the number of the sealed, 347.

Deacons, called Ministri, 331; mentioned by Hermas, ibid.; Clemens Romanus, 332; Ignatius, ibid.; Irenæus, 334, 335.

Decius, aggravated persecution by an edict, 278.

δέησιν, 97.

διχοτομήσει, 517.

δίγαμος, 195.

Dionysius of Corinth, information contained in a fragment of, 24.

Disciplina arcani, germ of the, 81; nature of it as taught by Origen, 91–94; and other early Fathers, 133.

Dissenters, the outcry against the Fathers joined in by, 123; why the Fathers are distasteful to them, 124, 125.

Dobree, Professor, an ingenious conjecture of, 308.

Dodwell, observation of, no the neglect of the early Fathers, 101; understands Clemens and Ignatius to speak of miraculous gifts, 311; under-

stood "ipsæ authenticæ literæ" of the autographs of the Apostles, 352.
Domitian, made laws against the Christians, 275.

Ecclesiastical Fund, its amount considerable, 250; applied to the maintenance of the clergy, ibid.; expenses of journeys and of conferences, 252–254; relief of orphans, widows, the sick and others, 255, 256.
Egyptians, the gospel according to, 51, 52.
Election, how understood by Justin Martyr, 496; by Irenæus, 497, 498; by Tertullian, 499, 500; by Clemens Alexandrinus, 500, 501; by Cyprian, 502, 503; by Origen, 504–506.
Eleutherus, Bishop of Rome, Irenæus was charged with a mission to, 253.
ἔντευξιν, 97.
Ephesians, the Epistle of St. Paul to the, whether properly so entitled, 354.
Ephesus, the eighth Canon of the Council of, 39.
ἐπίκλησις, 143, 180.
ἐπιούσιος, 250.
Episcopacy, the primitive form of Church Government, 330–343; the Fathers did not write treatises on it, 338, 343; imitated by the heretics, 343; nature of the evidence for it, 344; variety of quarters from which it is drawn, ibid.; language of Hooker on it, 345.
Eucharist, particulars relating to the celebration of, given by Tertullian, 31, 32; spoken of by the early Fathers in terms inconsistent with Transubstantiation, 33–36; 70, 87, 88; their language respecting it, 125; its ceremonial described by Justin Martyr, 134; invocation of the Holy Ghost on the elements modified by our Church, 180; the term προσφορὰ applied to it by Clemens Romanus, 446; nature of it as represented by Justin Martyr, 446–448; by Irenæus, 448–452; by Clemens Alexandrinus, 452–454; by Tertullian, 454–457; by Hippolytus, 457; by Origen, 458–461; by Cyprian, 461–464; preparation before it, and consistency of life after, taught by these Fathers, 464, 465.
εὐχαριστίαν, 97.
Eusebius, appealed to by Philpot, 11; misrepresented by Daillé, 22; a competent witness to the genuineness of the Epistles of Ignatius, 65; adopts the Fathers as his authorities, 160; quotes writers of the second century bearing testimony to the diffusion of Christianity, 227, 228, 231; considered the laws against the Christians to be in force from Nero downwards, 278; represents the persecution in Gaul as a sample of others, 284; records instances of martyrdom, 297; and details of persecution, 299, 301; bears witness to miraculous powers in the second century, 320; enumerates the clergy at Rome, 334; intimates that the Epistle to the Hebrews was generally attributed to St. Paul, 358.
Excommunication, offences against which it was levelled, 262.
ἐξομολόγησις, 42, 81.
Exorcism, claimed as existing in the early Church, by Justin, 311; by Irenæus, 312; by Tertullian, 315; by Minucius Felix, 317; by Origen, 318; more decidedly than other powers, 323.
ἐξωτερικῶν λόγων, 93.
Expenditure of the early Christians, circumstances which increased the, 252–256.
Extreme Unction, evidence in the early Fathers against, 117, 118.
Evans, Robert Wilson, remarks of, on a passage in Irenæus, 38; on the works of Clemens, 135.

Faith, Philpot offers to prove his from the Fathers, 12; their unanimity on the fundamental articles of the, 177; their use in maintaining orthodoxy, 383; that of the Sub-Apostolic Church Trinitarian, 393. *See* Creed.
Fall of man, sentiments of the Fathers on the, 470–481.
Fathers, the early, appealed to by our Church, 4–7, 178–181, 346; and by our Reformers, 8–14; estimate of them by English Reformed Divines, 122, 178, 179; little regarded by the Romanists, 101, 179; and by the later Councils, 101; depreciated by the Puritans, 15; and foreign Reformers, 20; and why, 15, 123–125. ——Objections of Daillé against them stated and answered, 22, 27, 46, 47, 58, 66, 105, 127, 132, 137, 146, 150, 152, 156, 159, 161, 164,

165, 167, 169, 174, 176. Principal objections of Barbeyrac against them stated and answered, 186, 195, 201, 203, 205, 206, 210, 211.——Remarks on the nature of their testimony, 27, 28, 128; on their value, 169, 213, 214; and on the proper method of studying them, 28, 45, 125, 162.——Use of their writings in relation to the evidences of Christianity, 220; their testimony to its wide diffusion, 221–230; to its secret progress, 231–236; to the rank of the Christians, 238–244; to their wealth, 245–256; to their character, 259–263; to their disinterestedness, 264–268; to the extent of persecution, 280–284; to its intensity, 293; to its nature, 301; to the continuance of miraculous powers, 310–321: to a Ministry of three Orders and an Episcopal Church, 329–343; to the Canon of Scripture, 346–351; to its substance, 359–364; to its text, 365–370, 375–382; their principle of interpretation evangelical not rationalistic, 384, 385, 390; their language compared with the Athanasian Creed, 397–408; their testimony on the Atonement, 417–426; on Baptism, 124, 426; on Baptismal Regeneration, 427–439; on the Baptism of Infants, 440; on the Eucharist, 125, 445–464; on the freedom of the will, 466–469; their language on the degree of human corruption, 152, 153, 469–481; on the necessity of Divine grace, 482–494; on the nature of it, 495, 496; on election, 496–506; interpret the New Testament with reference to early heresies, 507; their value as expositors, 517.

Fathers, the defence of the later, not undertaken in this work, 51, 122, 132, 177, 213.

Feuardentius replaced the five last chapters of Irenæus' work on heresies, 108.

Figures, the bread and the cup in the Eucharist so called, 36, 147, 449, 454.

Firmilianus, language of, towards Stephanus, 110, 114; defended by Pearson, 111.

Freedom of the will, testimony of the Fathers on the, 466–469.

Friars, mendicant, the language of Tertullian not satisfactory to, 84.

Foreknown, who are meant by the, 496, 497.

Games, the public, their effect on the propagation of Christianity, 236, 237; revolting details of, 290.

Genealogies of Christ, the, are referred to by Clemens, 369; and by Origen, 370.

Gibbon, remarks on the fifteenth and sixteenth chapters of his History, 220, 273; his unfairness in handling the evidence for the early dispersion of Christianity, 222, 223, 243; insinuates that the early Christians were almost all of the lower classes, 238; allows that a few were intelligent and wealthy, 241, 242; his acquaintance with the Fathers partial, 247; charges the Christians with receiving into their number abandoned characters, 258; mercenary persons, 264; and foundlings, 268; misrepresents the extent, 274; and the intensity of the persecutions, 293; his view of Pliny's correspondence with Trajan, ibid.; and of the martyrdom of Cyprian, 294; commends the narrative of Pontius, 295; endeavours to impair the authority of Eusebius, 301; overlooks the disturbing effect of Christianity on the domestic relations, ibid.

Gideon, the fleece of, how interpreted by Irenæus, 498.

Glossa ordinaria, refers to Fathers of a later date, 102.

γνῶσις, 80, 136, 516.

Gnostic, or perfect Christian, described by Clemens Alexandrinus, 184, 188.

Gnostics, the, appealed to an expression in the primitive Communion Service, 30, 31; notices of their tenets and practices, 45, 73, 153, 360, 485, 508, 509, 513; Scripture interpreted by the Fathers with reference to them, 508–516.

Godfathers and Godmothers, significance of the title of, 431.

Gospel, testimony to its early dispersion, 220–230; its secret progress illustrated, 231–236.

Gospels, the apocryphal, are quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, 50; and why, 53.

Gospels, the Four, are distinguished from apocryphal writings, 51, 52; testimony of Irenæus to their number,

76, 347; identity of ours with those of the first centuries, 359–362.
Grace, the Fathers believed in the doctrine of, 481–494.
Grace, irresistible, the statements of the Fathers inconsistent with the Calvinistic doctrine of, 495.
Griesbach, remarks on his Edition of the New Testament, 375, 376.
Grindal, Archbishop, passages from his Dialogue of Custom and Verity, 13–15.
Grotius, remarks of Dr. South on his Annotations, 389, 390; his rationalistic bias, 466.

Hadrian made no substantial change in Trajan's law, 277, 279; persecution was active under, 281.
Hall, Joseph, Bishop of Norwich, popularity of his Contemplations, 174.
Hammond, Dr. Henry, interprets St. John and St. Paul with reference to the Gnostic heresy, 508.
Healing, the miraculous gift of, claimed for the early Church by the Fathers, 311, 312, 315, 318; more decidedly than other powers, 323.
Heathen customs, why Tertullian dissuaded the Christians from, 205.
Heathens, were ill-informed on the affairs of the Christians, 239.
Hebrews, whether St. Paul was the author of the Epistle to the, 355–359.
Hegesippus, information contained in the fragments of, 25.
Heretics appealed to oral tradition, 30, 77; account of them in Tertullian, 123, 124; used arts to swell their congregations, 261; adopted the literal as opposed to the allegorical mode of interpretation, 170, 171; swelled the cry against the Christians, 291; affected a hierarchy, 339, 343; mutilated Scripture, 57, 364, 365; held that the God of the Old Testament was not the God of the New, 385; their doctrine a caricature of that of the Church, 395; information on the Sacrament of Baptism derived from their proceedings, 156, 428, 429; some of them Antinomians, 196, 467; their tenets a key to much of the New Testament, 507; succession of them, 509; condemned by anticipation in St. John, ibid.
Hermas, the Shepherd of, quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, 56; opinions of scholars on, 58; we have it only in a Latin version, 68; distinguishes the three Orders, 331; his language Trinitarian, 393; regeneration implied in his account of Baptism, 427; ascribes the virtues of Christians to the Holy Spirit, 482.
Herodians, why sent to Christ, 518.
Hippolytus, remains of, more considerable than Daillé represents them, 25; require re-editing, 85; not satisfactory to the Romanists, ibid.; the memorandum ascribed to him, an evidence of the early dispersion of Christianity, 230; bears witness to persecution in his time, 284; confirms a reading in the Revelation, 382; his testimony on the Trinity, 402; on the Incarnation, 407; on the Atonement, 422; on regeneration in Baptism, 437; on the Eucharist, 457; on the universality of Redemption, 504.
Holy Ghost, the Scriptures believed by the Fathers to be the work of the, 385; their testimonies to his Personality, 393, 399, 400; to his Divinity, 403; to his Procession, 404, 405; to his operation in Baptism, 429, 432–439; in the Eucharist, 180, 449, 464; and to the necessity of his influence for the restoration of man, 481–494. *See* Spiritual Influence.
Homilies, the, appeal to Scripture and the Fathers, 6; the Ante-Nicene often quoted in the second Book, only three times in the first, 102.
Hooker, Richard, a point in morality illustrated by, 185; his language to the Puritans on Episcopacy, 344, 345.
Horsley, Samuel, Bishop of St. Asaph, his method of dealing with Dr. Priestley, 28.
Host, the worship of the, evidence against, in the early Fathers, 36, 37.

ἰχθύς, 441.
ἰδίως, 129.
ἰδιώτης, 252.
Idolatry, connection of, with heathen trades, 202, 291; professions, 202, 203; customs, 205; offices of state, 206; passage from Tertullian's treatise on, 209.
ἱερουργίας, 40.
Ignatius, the Epistles of, considered spurious by Daillé, 58; referred to by Irenæus, 59; by Polycarp, 61; by Origen, 63; ours the same as

those known to Eusebius, 65; not the author of an Epistle to the Philippians, 159; his testimony to the number of Christian communities in Asia Minor, 227, 251; suffered in Trajan's reign, 281; probably refers to miraculous gifts, 310; remark on the Syriac text, 332; his testimony to the three Orders, ibid.; confirms the ordinary reading in Matt. xxvii. 52, 53, 370; and in Acts xx. 28, 376; his testimony on the Trinity, 393; on the Atonement, 417; on the influence of the Holy Spirit, 483.

Image-worship, use of the early Fathers in the argument against it, 43–45, 94, 95.

Improved Version, of the Unitarians, 366, 370, 379.

Incarnation, testimonies to the, 367, 369, 406, 407, 408, 412.

Indulgences, Papal, germ of in Cyprian, 120.

Infallibility of the Church of Rome, the impossibility of an universal defection from the faith magnified into the, 83.

Infant Baptism. *See* Baptism.

Infant Communion, alluded to by Cyprian, 158; not adopted by our Church, 180.

Interpretation, allegorical, of early date in the Church, 169; object of it, 170; no instance of historical truth being lost in it before Origen, 171; the literal, as opposed to it, preferred by Jews and heretics, 170, 171.

Interpretation of Scripture, the, depends much upon the principle adopted, 384, 389, 390, 466; and upon the standard referred to, 507.

Invocation of departed saints, how it gained a footing in the Church, 120.

Irenæus, referred to by Philpot, 10; by Grindal, 13; furnishes testimony bearing on Transubstantiation, 33; the Papal Supremacy, 37–38; the confessional, 41; image worship, 44, 45; refers to the Epistles of Ignatius, 59, 60; the Latin version not interpolated by the Romanists, 71, 72; his conjecture as to the name of Antichrist, 74; his language inconsistent with the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, ibid.; communion in one kind, ibid.; clerical celibacy, 75; worship of saints and angels, ibid.; tradition, 76–79; account of the last five chapters of his "Contra Hæreticos," 108; mentions a practice akin to Extreme Unction, 117, note; his language on the Eucharist, 143; on Episcopacy, ibid.; on secession from the Church, ibid.; quoted by Eusebius as a chief writer on heresies, 160; his ignorance of Hebrew, 167; allegorized Scripture, 170; but believed the incidents to be real, 171; errors imputed to him by Daillé, 174, 175; his testimony to the constancy of the Christians under persecution, 193; to the progress of the Gospel, 221, 222, 227, 229; to the intercourse of the Churches, 254; to the extent of the persecutions, 192, 291; to the continuance of miraculous power, 312; appeals to the succession as a guarantee for the right interpretation of Scripture, 329; uses the terms Bishop and Priest indifferently, 333; yet bears witness to the Primitive Church being Episcopalian, 334, 335; mentions the order of Deacons, 335; his testimony to the authority of the four Gospels, 347; the Acts, ibid.; the Epistles, 348; the Revelation, 349; and to their substance, 359–361; quotes a great part of the first chapter of St. Matthew, 367, 368; confirms various readings, 380, 381; finds the key to the Old Testament in the Advent of Christ, 384; interprets several incidents in it as significant of him, 386; understood Ephes. iv. 6, of the Trinity, 394; confirms the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, 397, 400, 401, 403, 404; his testimony on the Atonement, 418; on Regeneration in Baptism, 428; on Infant Baptism, 440; on the Eucharist, 448–452; teaches how to communicate worthily, 464; his views on free-will, 467; on the Fall, 472; on the necessity of Divine Grace, 485, 486; on the nature of spiritual influence, 495; on the possibility of salvation to all, 497; on predestination, 498; gives the succession of heretics, 509; understands St. Paul and St. John to speak with reference to the Gnostics, 184, 509–511.

James, St., 202.

James, St., the Epistle of, quoted by Irenæus, 348.

James the Just, account of, in the fragments of Hegesippus, 25.
James, Thomas, adduces no instance of Romish interpolation in any Father before Cyprian, 100, 105, 108.
Jewel, John, Bishop of Salisbury, the Apology of, 8; his estimate of patristic testimony, 122; his use of it, 178.
Jews, the bitterest persecutors of the Christians, 291; method of the Fathers in contending with, 384, 385.
John, St., 202; restored a penitent to the Church, 258; credit due to the story of his being cast into a bath of hot oil, 298; the first and the second Epistles, and the Revelation of, quoted by Irenæus, 349; the third mentioned by Eusebius, 351; the substance of the Gospel the same in the earliest times as it is now, 360; many passages have reference to the early heresies, 509, 510.
Johnson, Dr. Samuel, a remark of on the Revolution, 18.
Jones, Jeremiah, gives the titles of apocryphal books, 47, 54; establishes the canon of Scripture by an appeal to tradition, 347.
Jude, St., particulars respecting the grandsons of, 25; his Epistle quoted by Clemens and Tertullian, 351.
Judas, use of his example in Cyprian, 503; and in Origen, 505.
Justin Martyr, Daillé's account of his writings imperfect, 27, 28; information derived from his Apologies, 29; describes the administration of the Eucharist, 36; and other parts of the Christian ritual, 133; replies to the charge of atheism, 44; and other calumnies, 239, 269; quotes the Sibylline verses, 48; a passage supposed favourable to the worship of angels, 69; his language inconsistent with Romish tenets, 70, 117, note; how made use of by the Socinians, 151; his inaccuracies, 165, 166, 483, note; ignorance of Hebrew, 167; use of allegory, 171; doctrinal errors, 174; does not encourage the Christians to volunteer martyrdom, 186; his personal history, 193, 232, 241, 282; bears witness to the diffusion of Christianity, 221; occasion of his Apologies, 186, 187, 282, 288; gives details of persecution, 299; attributes miraculous powers to Christians in his time, 311; the Gospels known to him the same as ours, 362; interprets several things in the Old Testament as significant of the Cross, 386; his testimony to the coeternity and consubstantiality of the Son, 129, 130; to the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, 398, 404, 406; the Atonement, 417; Regeneration in Baptism, 428; Infant Baptism, 440; the obligations of Baptism, 441; the qualifications and obligations of communicants, 464, 465; the freedom of the will, 466; the doctrine of spiritual influence, 483, 484; what he understood by the foreknown, 496; confirms a statement of Origen, 521.

Kaye, John, Bishop of Lincoln, shows that the edicts of Nero remained unrepealed, 275; produces a passage in Clemens Alexandrinus on the continuance of miraculous powers, 316; his theory respecting them, 327; his interpretation of "Ipsæ Authenticæ Literæ," 352; doubts the genuineness of the "Cohortatio ad Græcos" ascribed to Justin Martyr, 483, note; investigates the pretensions of Montanus, 489, note.

Laius, the story of, made use of by Origen, 505.
Last times, meaning of the, 515.
Lebbæus, Mesopotamia assigned to, 231.
Lector, 259.
Libellatici, a considerable class in the time of Cyprian, 256.
Libelli, furnished by the Martyrs to the lapsed, 120, 121, 342; abuse of, 120.
Libelli, or certificates of exemption from persecution, 289.
λιβέλλων, 40.
Liturgy. *See* Prayer Book.
Lord's Supper, water instead of wine and water, used by certain heretics in the, 34; the doctrine of the Socinians on it opposed to the early Fathers, 445. *See* Eucharist.
Luke, St., the Gospel according to, quoted by Clemens Alexandrinus, 52; the preface implies the existence of other histories, 53; the substance the same now as in the time of Irenæus, 361.

Lyons and Vienne, the Epistle from the Churches of, shows the progress of Christianity in Gaul and Asia, 227; speaks of Vettius Epagathus as a person of rank, 243; and of his martyrdom, 288; illustrates the disturbance of domestic relations, 305.

Mackintosh, Sir James, his remark on Gibbon, 273.
Macknight, James, a conjecture of, 355.
Magistrate, the office of a, why it was objectionable for a Christian to hold, 206–209.
Magistrates, the Roman, persecution of the Christians by, 286; some severe, some lenient, 287; their proceedings uncontrolled, 288, 289.
Manuscripts of the early Fathers generally few in number, 67, 68; those of Cyprian numerous, 68, note; impracticability of corrupting them so that all should conspire, 107.
Marcion, tenets of, 35, 153, 363, 377, 433, 470, 499, 513, 514, 515; changed the title of the Epistle to the Ephesians, 354.
Mark, St., the Gospel according to, the same now as in the time of Irenæus, 359.
Marriage, terms in which some of the Fathers speak of it accounted for, 163, 195–200.
Marriage of the Clergy, not prohibited in Origen's time, 95, 96.
Martyr, the title of, not easily bestowed, 282, note.
Martyrdom, a disposition to court it not encouraged by the Fathers, 186–190; their language respecting it accounted for, 190–192; instrumental in the propagation of the Gospel, 192–194; early records of it not to be confounded with the fictions of later times, 296.
Mary, the Virgin, language of Irenæus respecting, 71–73.
Matthew, St., the Gospel according to, mentioned by name in Clemens Alexandrinus, 52; the first chapter quoted by Irenæus, 367, 368; the genealogy by Clemens, 369.
Matthias, St., Irenæus refers to the election of, 363.
Matthias, the traditions of, 51, 54.
Melchizedek, a prophet among the nations of the East, 49; a personification of the Saviour, 454.
Melito, confirms the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, 407; yet wrote concerning the creation and generation of Christ, 409; his testimony on the Atonement, 419.
Middleton, Thomas Fanshawe, Bishop of Calcutta, interprets 1 Cor. v. 9, 353; confirms a conjecture of Macknight, 355; remarks on the Socinian view of Rom. ix. 5, 375, note.
Millenarians, how far countenanced in the Fathers, 162, 163.
Millennium, Justin believed in the, 174.
Milton, John, his opinion of the Fathers, 16, 17; and of the Reformers, 17.
Ministry, the, described by the Fathers as consisting of three Orders deriving their authority from the commission of Christ to his Apostles, 330; those who withdraw from it considered by the Fathers to withdraw from the Church, 330, 332.
Minucius Felix, replies to the charge of worshipping the Cross, 44; bears testimony to the number of the Christians, 226; the incidental progress of the Gospel illustrated from his Octavius, 233; assigns to Cæcilius an insinuation repeated by Gibbon, 239; makes him call the Christians "homines illicitæ factionis," 278; claims the power of exorcism, 317.
Miraculous powers, difficulty of ascertaining how long they continued in the Church, 310; testimony of the early Fathers to their continuance, 310–320; those of exorcism and healing most generally claimed by them, 323; and most frequently exercised in the Acts, 324, 325; theory of Bishop Kaye respecting them, 327.
Montanists, pretensions of the, 253, 359, 489, 490.
Moses, mistake of Clemens respecting his name, 167; he shows that the Greeks derived their knowledge from, 148, 369.
Mosheim, quotes no authority for the repeal of the laws against the Christians, 275; referred to by Gibbon, 293; attributes a misapprehension to Tertullian, 298; changed his opinion respecting Montanus, 489, note.

Nero, made laws against the Christians, 275.
Newcome, William, Archbishop of Armagh, his translation made the basis of the Improved Version, 370.
Nice, the sixth Canon of the Council of, 103.
Nonjurors, the, represent the old Church feeling, 19; renewed Jewel's challenge, 122.
Novatianus, Cornelius writes to Cyprian concerning, 109; his treatise on the Trinity, 159.
Novitioli, 259.

Oblation of fine flour, a type of the bread in the Eucharist, 446.
Oblations, *προσφοράς*, applied to the Eucharist by Clemens Romanus, 446, the material elements included in them by Justin, 447; by Irenæus, 448; by Origen, 459.
Offering, a pure, Mal. i. 11, applied to the Eucharist by Justin, 446.
οἰκονομίαν, 146.
ὁμολογία, 441.
ὁμοούσιος, 129.
Opus operatum, the efficacy of the Sacraments not attributed to the, 440, 464.
Orders, the Christian ministry described by the Fathers as consisting of three, 330.
Ordination, the mode of transmitting the authority conveyed by Christ to the Apostles, 330; the prerogative of the Bishop, 342, 343.
Ordinations, not to be held by Bishops out of their own Dioceses, 40.
Oriens, a name of Christ, 458.
Origen, his opinion on the "Preaching of Peter," 54; quotes the Epistles of Ignatius, 63; state of his writings, 86, 107, 413, 414; they are not interpolated by the Romanists, 87–99; his testimony unfavourable to the corporal presence, 87, 88; to prayers in a tongue not understood by the people, 88; to the withholding of the Scriptures, 89; his views on the Disciplina arcani, 91–94; his language clearly opposed to the use of images, 94; the celibacy of the clergy, 95; the worship of angels, 97, 98; his notion of Purgatory, 99; remarks on the Contra Celsum, 100; some of his Homilies dictated offhand, 165; his acquaintance with Hebrew limited, 168; his use of allegory, 172; his views on martyrdom, 189, 190; bears testimony to the progress of Christianity, 224, 225; to the rank of the Christians, 239, 243; to their character, 261; and disinterestedness, 264; to the extent of the persecutions, 283; is misrepresented by Gibbon, 285; describes the different quarters from which persecution issued, 286, 299; speaks of miraculous powers in his time, 317–319; appeals to the succession, 330, note; gives testimony to a ministry of three Orders, 341; mentions the third Epistle of St. John, 351; assigns the Epistle to the Hebrews to St. Paul, 356–358; asserts the authority of the Gospels, 362; dates the first Epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus, 374; considered the Saviour the chief subject of ancient prophecy, 385; confirms the Athanasian Creed, 398, 401, 402, 403, 405, 406, 407, 408; his unguarded language accounted for, 410–415; his testimony on the Atonement, 423, 424; on regeneration in Baptism, 436; on the Eucharist, 458–461; on the qualifications of the communicant, 465; on the freedom of the will, 32, 468, 505; on the consequences of the Fall, 479; on the necessity of Divine grace, 492; his sentiments on election, 504–506; ascribes Calvinistic tenets to the Valentinians, 505; furnishes a clue to the question whether the Jews possessed the power of capital punishment, 520.

Paley, Archdeacon, thought that the Epistle to the Ephesians was written to the Laodiceans, 355; dated the first Epistle to the Corinthians from Ephesus, 375.
Papias, tells us that Barsabas having drunk a poison sustained no hurt, 298; and that one was raised from the dead in Philip's time, 313.
Paschasinus, conduct of, at the Council of Chalcedon, 103.
Passover, the, is compared with the Passion by Tertullian, 35, 36.
Patience, necessary to the early Christians, 210; Cyprian and Tertullian composed essays on it, 211.
Paul, St., pre-eminence assigned to, by

Irenæus, 37; his example in risking martyrdom, 192; found Italy already inhabited by Christians, 231; met with different treatment at his two visits to Rome, 232; dates of his release and of his death, 231, note; the disturbing effect of Christianity shown from his writings, 234; connection of a passage in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, 308; several visions of his mentioned in the Acts, 327; use of the Fathers in proving the genuineness of his Epistles, 348–350; whether his autograph was preserved in Tertullian's time, 352; whether he was the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews, 355–359; whether any Epistle to the Corinthians is missing, 353; his first Epistle to that Church written from Ephesus, 374; use of the Fathers in interpreting his Epistles, 510–513.

Pearson, John, Bishop of Chester, defends the Epistle of Barnabas, 58; was not aware of the second reference in Irenæus to Ignatius' Epistles, 60; gives instances of their coincidence with that of Polycarp, 62; argues that the Commentary on the Canticles was Origen's, 63; asserts the competency of Eusebius, 65; defends Firmilian, 111.

Pelagianism, the Fathers unjustly charged with, 481.

Penitents, method of re-admitting, 262.

Perron, Cardinal, a suggestion of, adopted by Daillé, 146.

Persecution, its effect on the domestic relations, 197, 301–305; money given to magistrates to buy it off, 256, 289; extenuated by Gibbon, 273, 293; the notion of ten great ones untenable, 274; continued with some intermissions during the first three centuries, 278–284; proceeded not only from the Emperors, but from the magistrates, 286–289; and the populace, 290, 291; details of it in the Fathers, 299–301.

Peter, St., how spoken of by Cyprian, 39, 106, 111; germ of the undue exaltation of, 81, 83; remarks on his vision, 326; both his Epistles quoted by Irenæus, 349; the second by Theophilus, 349, note.

Peter, the Preaching of, 54, 55; the Acts of, 54, 56.

πεζούς, 253.

Pharaoh, his heart hardened judicially, 499.

Philemon, the Epistle of St. Paul to, is referred to by Theophilus, 349; and Tertullian, 350.

Philip, St., 313.

Philo, influence of, on the interpretation of Scripture, 172.

Philocalia of Origen, 64.

Philpot, John, appealed to antiquity, 10–12.

Plato, why referred to by the Fathers, 48; called the philosopher of the Hebrews, 139; says a lie is unworthy of God, but sometimes profitable to men, 149.

πλήρωμα, 516.

Pliny, the laws against the Christians unrepealed in the time of, 276; remarks on his Letter, 293; mentions hymns to Christ, 388.

Polycarp in his Epistle to the Philippians speaks expressly of Ignatius' Epistles, 61; is quoted by Eusebius, 160; an incident at his martyrdom, 237; suffered in the reign of Aurelius, 282.

Polycarp, the Martyrdom of, a clause in it respecting a dove probably corrupt, 298.

Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, his Epistle to Victor an evidence of the progress of Christianity, 227; called a synod at Ephesus, 254.

Pontius, the Deacon, his narrative of Cyprian's martyrdom, 294, 295; commended by Gibbon, 295; mentions a vision of Cyprian, ibid.

Pope, change in the meaning of the word, 144. *See* Supremacy.

Porson, Professor, points out an error in Gibbon's History, 223.

Portio, 250.

Pothinus, Bishop of Lyons, suffered in the reign of Aurelius, 282.

Prayer Book, the principles of its construction explained in the Preface, 4, 5; a more direct channel of primitive tradition than the Articles, 5; the Fathers bear witness to its general style and particular observances, 125; Lectures on it delivered by the author, 346, note. *See* Ritual.

Prayers for the dead, grew into mortuary masses, 82.

Prayers in a tongue not understood by the people inconsistent with the sentiments of Origen, 88.

Predestinate, meaning of the, as understood by Clemens, 501.
Predestination. *See* Election.
Presbyters, how spoken of in Scripture, 330, 331; called Doctores by Hermas, 331; this term and that of Bishops at first synonymous, 332, 333; yet the offices distinct, 334–338, 341; number of them at Rome, 334; did not act without reference to their Bishop, 342.
Priesthood, a parallel between the Jewish and the Christian in Clemens Romanus, 331.
Priestley, Dr. Joseph, his method of reading, 28; employed the same expedient as Daillé to extinguish evidence on Christ's Divinity, 67; affirms that the doctrine of the Atonement is a departure from primitive Christianity, 416.
προεστώς, 340.
Prometheus of Æschylus, remark on the, 50.
Promises in Baptism, alluded to by the Fathers, 31, 441; sponsors to look to their fulfilment, 260.
πρωτεία, 103.
Protestants, principles of, according to Daillé, 178.
πρωτοκαθεδρία, 337.
Psalms, the, applied by the Fathers to Jesus Christ, 386—388; used in Christian assemblies, 388.
Purgatory, a saying of Jesus preserved by Justin opposed to, 70; the language of Irenæus inconsistent with a belief of it, 74; as is that of Hippolytus, 85; four passages of Clemens Alexandrinus supposed to refer to it, 80; germ of it in Tertullian, 83; derived in the first instance from heathen philosophy, 99; countenanced by Origen, 99; and by Cyprian, yet not so as to satisfy a Romanist, 115–117.
Puritans, the, opposed to the respect for antiquity, 15; the sympathies of the foreign Reformed Churches went along with, 20; language of Hooker towards, 345.

Quadratus, addressed his Apology to Hadrian, 281.

Racovian Catechism, statements of the, on the Godhead, 392; on the death of Christ, 416, 418, 419; on the necessity of faith, 420; on Baptism, 426, 427; on original sin, 427; on the Lord's Supper, 445, 448; on the interpretation of St. John, vi. 35, 48, 51, 453, note.
Rebellion, the Great, its effect on the study of antiquity, 15.
Reformation, principles of the English, 5, 8, 9, 178; reverence for antiquity a characteristic of, 15.
Reformation, the stir of the, tempted the Romanists to falsify tradition, 107.
Reformers, the English, appealed to antiquity, 8–14; Milton's opinion of, 17, 18.
Revelation of St. John, testimony of Irenæus to the canonical authority of the, 349.
Revolution, influence of the, on the taste for patristic learning, 18.
Ridley, Nicholas, Bishop of London, took higher Church grounds than others, 9.
Ritual, the primitive, exposition of in Justin, Tertullian and Irenæus, 133, 134.
Romanists, the, have not tampered with the writings of the Fathers before Cyprian, 69–100; the early Fathers little read or regarded by them, 101, 103; their corruption of Cyprian limited to a few known instances, 105–108; evidence against them in his writings, 109–119.
Romans, the Epistle of St. Paul to the, understood in a sense unfavourable to the Calvinistic interpretation by Irenæus, 498; and by Origen, 505.
Routh, Dr. M. J., President of Magdalene College, Fragments of the early Fathers collected by, 24; his estimate of them, ibid.; notices a fragment of Origen discovered by Grabe, 64.
Rufinus, admits that he misrepresented Origen, 86, 107; and modified the "De Principiis," 414; his version of the Homilies on the books of Moses generally trustworthy, 459.

Sacraments, prominence given to the Two by Tertullian, 84; by Cyprian, 118; their administration described by Justin, 134; more reverenced in the Primitive Church than at present, 144; depression of them by the Socinians, 426. *See* Baptism, Eucharist.

Sacrifice, the Eucharist so called in a spiritual sense by Justin, 446; by Irenæus, 448, 449; by Tertullian, 455; by Hippolytus, 457; by Origen, 459.
Saints, what Tertullian meant by, 499.
Saints' Days, the Fathers bear witness to the early observance of, 125.
Saints, anniversaries of, mentioned by Tertullian, 32; abuses connected with, 82.
Scripture, appealed to in conjunction with antiquity by our Church, 6, 79, 178; by our Reformers, 8, 13; difficulty of deciding the Canon of, in early times, 56; the early Fathers favourable to a free circulation of, 74, 89, 90, 91; represented as the authority to appeal to, by Irenæus, 76; use of the Fathers in settling the Canon, 346–359; and in ascertaining the substance, 359–364; the text, 365–382; the meaning, 383–521.
Senior quidam, quoted by Irenæus, 170.
Septuagint version, the, made known the Scriptures to the Gentiles, 49; mistake of Justin respecting it, 165; reverence in which it was held, 212.
Serapion, Bishop of Antioch, 227, 228; visited Rhossus, 253.
Serenius Granianus, Proconsul of Asia, 277, 281.
Severus, the persecution of the Christians continued in the reign of, 282.
Sibyl, account of the, in Justin, 49.
Sibyl, the verses of the, quoted by Justin and Theophilus, 48; Bishop Bull's opinion of their origin, 49; made use of by Virgil, 50; their authority debated by the early Christians, ibid.
Simon Magus, statue of, 165; the first of the heretics, 395; an unintentional witness to the doctrine of the Trinity, ibid.
Socinians, the Fathers have been laid under contribution by the, 151; adopt a rationalistic system of interpretation, 384; the Fathers opposed to their leading doctrines, 392, 416; their numbers increased by the neglect of the study of the Fathers, 426; depress the nature and efficacy of the Sacraments, ibid.; deny original sin, 427; the study of the Fathers a safeguard against their opinions, 434; differ from the Church of England on the Lord's Supper in two particulars, 445.
Socrates, language of, on sin after Baptism, 443.
South, Dr. Robert, his opinion of Grotius, 389, 390, note.
Spectator, coincidence between a passage in Clemens and a paper in the, 246, note.
Spiritual influence, nature of, according to the Fathers, 495.
Stephanus, Bishop of Rome, Cyprian differed from, 38, 39; language of Cyprian towards, 109, 110.
Suetonius, a passage from his Life of Vespasian, 50.
συναΐδιος, 129.
Superstition, a motive of persecution, 290.
Supremacy, the Papal, objected against the Romanists, by Philpot, 11; evidence against it in the early Fathers, 37–40; germ of it, 83.
Susanna, a difficulty in the history of, 168.
Symbolical language of Holy Scripture, a remark of Origen on the, 391.
Symbols, the elements in the Eucharist called, 147, 454.
Synods of the clergy, frequent in the early Church, 254.

Tatian, gives an account of his conversion, 241; mentions the exposure of children, 270; his tenets on the consequences of the Fall, 470; and on the necessity of Divine grace, 484.
Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, adorned his writings by appeals to numberless authors, 53; a case of casuistry entertained by, 149.
τέκτων, 361.
τέλειοι, 77.
Temples of false gods, character of the, 204.
θεούς, why so called according to Clemens, 213.
Tertullian, appealed to by Grindal, 14; information on questions of modern controversy in his "De Coronâ," 31, 32; and "Adv. Marcionem," 35, 36; the Confession described by him a public act, 42; replies to the charge of worshipping the Cross, 44; was acquainted with the Epistles of Ignatius, 62; germ of Romish errors discoverable in his writings, 82, 83; especially in those written after he

became a Montanist, 83; the peculiar tenets of the Romanist contradicted in others, 83, 84; use of his writings in the Arian controversy, 131; though some passages are liable to misconstruction, 130, 151; difficulty of his style, 140; method of studying him, 141, 142; his inconsistencies, 154, 155; use of allegory, 172; views on martyrdom, 188, 189, 192; and appeal to Scapula, 193; some of his treatises composed before he became a Montanist, some after, 198, 224, 228; his treatise "Ad Uxorem" exhibits the forebodings of a Christian husband, 198, 199; why he denounced certain trades, 201, 202, 306; professions, 203; customs, 205; offices, 206; his testimony to the wide dispersion of Christianity in his time, 223, 224, 254; to the rank and wealth of the Christians, 242, 243, 246, 255; charges the heretics with using arts to swell their congregations, 261; reproaches the heathen for exposing their children, 270; his remarks on the laws against the Christians, 275, 278, 281; account of his Apology, 282; and "Ad Scapulam," 283; mentions the different dispositions of heathen magistrates, 287; details of persecution, 299, 300; the disturbing effect of Christianity on the domestic relations, 302, 304; injury to worldly prospects, 306; embarrassment in legal and commercial transactions, 308; bears testimony to the continuance of miraculous powers, 316; and to the three Orders of the Ministry, 338; refers to St. Paul's Epistle to Philemon, 350; quotes St. Jude, 351; what he meant by "ipsæ authenticæ litteræ," 352; the substance of St. Paul's Epistles the same in his time as it is now, 363; the controversy on 1 John v. 7. turns on a passage in his "Adv. Praxeam," 371; confirms the received reading in Acts xx. 28, 377; and the authorized translation in Rom. ix. 5, 380; his testimony to the doctrine of the Athanasian Creed, 398, 399, 403, 404, 405, 406, 407, 408; though his language is sometimes unguarded, 409; to the Atonement, 421; the effects of Baptism, 433; the use of sponsors, 440; the obligations of Baptism, 441; his sentiments on the Eucharist, 454–457; and the obligations of Communicants, 464; on the freedom of the will, 467; on the consequences of the Fall, 473–476; on the necessity of Divine grace, 490, 491; on election and predestination, 499; and on assurance, 500; explains the New Testament with reference to early heresies, 513, 514.

Ter-Sanctus, the Liturgical use of the, an evidence of a Trinitarian Creed, 394.

Testament, the harmony of the Old and the New argued against the heretics, 385.

Testimony of the Fathers, incidental and undesigned, 27, 28; its value arising from that circumstance, 33, 128.

Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, quotes the Sibyl, 48; his mistakes in etymology, 167; his use of allegory, 171; complains that Autolycus was unacquainted with Christian writings, 230; mentions the Christians being stoned, 299; alludes to the miracle of raising the dead, 314; quotes St. James, 349, note; and St. Paul to Philemon, 349; finds types of the Trinity and of Baptism in Genesis i., 386, 395; his testimony on regeneration in Baptism, 429; the effects of the Fall, 472; the necessity of grace, 484.

Thomas, St., 230.

Trades, why certain are denounced by Tertullian, 202, 203; those connected with idolatry injured by the progress of Christianity, 291; some incompatible with it, 306.

Tradition, in what sense appealed to by Irenæus, 76–78; his views of it unfavourable to the modern Church of Rome, and agreeing with those of the Church of England, 78, 79.

Tradition, unwritten, eventually grew to tradition as the rival of Scripture, 82.

Trajan, did not repeal, 275; only mitigated the laws against the Christians, 276, 278; persecution went on in his reign, 281.

Translations of the Fathers, value of early, 68.

Transubstantiation, a late plantation of the Bishop of Rome, 11; testimony against it in the early Fathers, 32; in Irenæus, 33; in Cyprian, 34, 35,

112; in Tertullian, 35; involves the worship of the Host, 36; language of Justin inconsistent with it, 70; passages in Tertullian which contradict it, 83, note; not held by Hippolytus, 85: nor by Origen, 87, 88. *See* Eucharist.
Trinity, testimonies to the doctrine of the, 392–406.
Types, the application of, a trial of faith, 391, 392.

Unitarians deny the genuineness of St. Matthew's account of the miraculous conception, 366.
Unity of God, the, argued by Irenæus, 359; testimonies to, 400, 403, 404, 405, 406.
Unity of the Church, taught by the Fathers, 15; not broken by difference of customs, 114.
Usher, James, Archbishop of Armagh, respects the Epistles of Barnabas, 58.

Valentinians, tenets of the, 30, 153, 261, 350, 367, 368.
Victor, Bishop of Rome, remonstrated with by Irenæus, 38.
Visions, mentioned by Tertullian, 315; by Cyprian, 320; evidence of them not easy to be rejected, 326; their frequency in the Acts, 326, 327; foretold by Joel, 327.
Visitation of the sick, the Service for the, moves the sick man to make a special confession, 41; recalls the profession made in Baptism, 442.

Walton, Isaac, a well-known passage of his Fisherman, 295.
Waterland, Dr. Daniel, finds room for a "Discourse on Fundamentals," 157; his remarks on the allegorical method of interpretation, 174; on the use of the Fathers in interpreting Scripture, 178; on Barbeyrac's charges against Athenagoras, 195; draws his vouchers for the Athanasian Creed chiefly from Augustine, 397, explains what the Fathers meant by the sanctification of the symbols in the Sacraments, 436, 451.
Wesley, John, revival attempted by, 19.
Wetstein, John James, his list of various readings on Acts xx. 28, incomplete and inaccurate, 376.
Will, the freedom of the, asserted by the Fathers, 466–469; their statements on it incompatible with Calvinistic doctrines, 495, 496.
Wilson, William, remarks of, on Priestley, 67; on the testimony of Simon Magus to the doctrine of the Trinity, 395.
Worship of angels, not favoured by Justin, 69; nor by Irenæus, 75; Simon Magus charged with teaching it, 84; language of Origen inconsistent with it, 97.
Worship of Saints, opposed to the teaching of Irenæus, 75; views of Origen on the, 96, 97.
Worship of the Virgin Mary, the language of Irenæus not favourable to, 71–73; nor that of Tertullian, 84.

Woodfall and Kinder, Printers, Angel Court, Skinner Street, London.

WORKS BY THE REV. J. J. BLUNT, B.D.,

LATE MARGARET PROFESSOR AT CAMBRIDGE.

I.

PRINCIPLES for the PROPER UNDERSTANDING of the MOSAIC WRITINGS, stated and applied; together with an Incidental Argument for the Truth of the Resurrection of our Lord. Post 8vo, 6*s.* 6*d.*

II.

UNDESIGNED COINCIDENCES in the WRITINGS of the OLD and NEW TESTAMENTS, an Argument of their VERACITY; with an Appendix containing undesigned Coincidences between the Gospels, Acts, and Josephus. Fifth Edition. 8vo, 9*s.*

III.

THE HISTORY of the CHURCH in the FIRST THREE CENTURIES. Second Edition. 8vo, 9*s.* 6*d.*

IV.

THE RIGHT USE of the EARLY FATHERS; a Course of Lectures delivered in the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. 8vo.

V.

THE PARISH PRIEST; His ACQUIREMENTS, PRINCIPAL OBLIGATIONS and DUTIES. A Course of Lectures delivered at the University of Cambridge. Second Edition. Post 8vo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

VI.

THIRTY-SIX PLAIN SERMONS. Preached before a Country Congregation. Second Edition. Post 8vo, 7*s.* 6*d.*

VII.

A SECOND SERIES of PLAIN SERMONS. Post 8vo.

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET.

Albemarle Street, London.
January, 1859.

MR. MURRAY'S

GENERAL LIST OF WORKS.

ABBOTT'S (Rev. J.) Philip Musgrave; or, Memoirs of a Church of England Missionary in the North American Colonies. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

ABERCROMBIE'S (John, M.D.) Enquiries concerning the Intellectual Powers and the Investigation of Truth. *Fifteenth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

———— Philosophy of the Moral Feelings. *Tenth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.*

———— Pathological and Practical Researches on the Diseases of the Stomach, &c. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

ACLAND'S (Rev. Charles) Popular Account of the Manners and Customs of India. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

ADDISON'S WORKS. A New Edition, with a New Life and Notes. By Rev. Whitwell Elwin. 4 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

ADOLPHUS'S (J. L.) Letters from Spain, in 1856 and 1857. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

ÆSCHYLUS. (The Agamemnon and Choephoræ.) Edited, with Notes. By Rev. W. Peile, D.D. *Second Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo. 9*s.* each.

ÆSOP'S FABLES. A New Translation. With Historical Preface. By Rev. Thomas James, M.A. With 100 Woodcuts, by John Tenniel and J. Wolf. *26th Thousand.* Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

AGRICULTURAL (The) Journal. Of the Royal Agricultural Society of England. 8vo. 10*s.* *Published half-yearly.*

AMBER-WITCH (The). The most interesting Trial for Witchcraft ever known. Translated from the German by Lady Duff Gordon. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

ARABIAN NIGHTS ENTERTAINMENT. Translated from the Arabic, with Explanatory Notes. By E. W. Lane. *A New Edition.* Edited by E. Stanley Poole. With 600 Woodcuts. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

ARTHUR'S (Little) History of England. By Lady Callcott. *Eighteenth Edition.* With 20 Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

AUNT IDA'S Walks and Talks; a Story Book for Children. By a Lady. Woodcuts. 16mo. 5*s.*

AUSTIN'S (Sarah) Fragments from German Prose Writers. With Biographical Notes. Post 8vo. 10*s.*

———— Translation of Ranke's History of the Popes of Rome. *Third Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo. 24*s.*

ADMIRALTY PUBLICATIONS; Issued by direction of the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty:—

1. A MANUAL OF SCIENTIFIC ENQUIRY, for the Use of Officers in H.M. Navy and Travellers in General. By Various Hands. *Third Edition, revised.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo.

2. AIRY'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS MADE AT GREENWICH. 1836 to 1847. Royal 4to. 50*s.* each.

——— ASTRONOMICAL RESULTS. 1848 to 1856. 4to. 8*s.* each.

3. ——— APPENDICES TO THE ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS.

1836.—I. Bessel's Refraction Tables.
II. Tables for converting Errors of R.A. and N.P.D. into Errors of Longitude and Ecliptic P.D. } 8*s.*
1837.—I. Logarithms of Sines and Cosines to every Ten Seconds of Time.
II. Table for converting Sidereal into Mean Solar Time. } 8*s.*
1842.—Catalogue of 1439 Stars. 8*s.*
1845.—Longitude of Valentia, 8*s.*
1847.—Twelve Years' Catalogue of Stars. 14*s.*
1851.—Maskelyne's Ledger of Stars. 6*s.*
1852.—I. Description of the Transit Circle. 5*s.*
II. Regulations of the Royal Observatory. 2*s.*
1853.—Bessel's Refraction Tables. 3*s.*
1854.—I. Description of the Zenith Tube. 3*s.*
II. Six Years' Catalogue of Stars. 10*s.*

4. ——— MAGNETICAL AND METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS. 1840 to 1847. Royal 4to. 50*s.* each.

——— MAGNETICAL AND METEOROLOGICAL RESULTS. 1848 to 1855. 4to. 8*s.* each.

5. ——— ASTRONOMICAL, MAGNETICAL, AND METEOROLOGICAL OBSERVATIONS, 1848 to 1854. Royal 4to. 50*s.* each.

6. ——— REDUCTION OF THE OBSERVATIONS OF PLANETS, 1750 to 1830. Royal 4to. 50*s.*

7. ——— LUNAR OBSERVATIONS. 1750 to 1830. 2 Vols. Royal 4to. 50*s.* each.

8. BERNOULLI'S SEXCENTENARY TABLE. *London*, 1779. 4to.

9. BESSEL'S AUXILIARY TABLES FOR HIS METHOD OF CLEARING LUNAR DISTANCES. 8vo.

10. ——— FUNDAMENTA ASTRONOMIÆ: *Regiomontii*, 1818. Folio. 60*s.*

11. BIRD'S METHOD OF CONSTRUCTING MURAL QUADRANTS. *London*, 1768. 4to. 2*s.* 6*d.*

12. ——— METHOD OF DIVIDING ASTRONOMICAL INSTRUMENTS. *London*, 1767. 4to. 2*s.* 6*d.*

13. COOK, KING, AND BAYLY'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS. *London*, 1782. 4to. 21*s.*

14. EIFFE'S ACCOUNT OF IMPROVEMENTS IN CHRONOMETERS. 4to. 2*s.*

15. ENCKE'S BERLINER JAHRBUCH, for 1830. *Berlin*, 1828. 8vo. 9*s.*

16. GROOMBRIDGE'S CATALOGUE OF CIRCUMPOLAR STARS. 4to. 10*s.*

17. HANSEN'S TABLES DE LA LUNE. 4to. 20*s.*

17. HARRISON'S PRINCIPLES OF HIS TIME-KEEPER. PLATES. 1767. 4to. 5*s.*

18. HUTTON'S TABLES OF THE PRODUCTS AND POWERS OF NUMBERS. 1781. Folio. 7*s.* 6*d.*

19. LAX'S TABLES FOR FINDING THE LATITUDE AND LONGITUDE. 1821. 8vo. 10*s.*

ADMIRALTY PUBLICATIONS—*continued.*

20. LUNAR OBSERVATIONS at GREENWICH. 1783 to 1819. Compared with the Tables, 1821. 4to. 7*s.* 6*d.*
22. MASKELYNE'S ACCOUNT OF THE GOING OF HARRISON'S WATCH. 1767. 4to. 2*s.* 6*d.*
21. MAYER'S DISTANCES of the MOON'S CENTRE from the PLANETS. 1822, 3*s.*; 1823, 4*s.* 6*d.* 1824 to 1835, 8vo. 4*s.* each.
23. ——— THEORIA LUNÆ JUXTA SYSTEMA NEWTONIANUM. 4to. 2*s.* 6*d.*
24. ——— TABULÆ MOTUUM SOLIS ET LUNÆ. 1770. 4to. 5*s.*
25. ——— ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS MADE AT GOTTINGEN, from 1756 to 1761. 1826. Folio. 7*s.* 6*d.*
26. NAUTICAL ALMANACS, from 1767 to 1861. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* each.
27. ——— SELECTIONS FROM THE ADDITIONS up to 1812. 8vo. 5*s.* 1834-54. 8vo. 5*s.*
28. ——— SUPPLEMENTS, 1828 to 1833, 1837 and 1838. 8vo. 2*s.* each.
29. ——— TABLE requisite to be used with the N.A. 1781. 8vo. 5*s.*
30. POND'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS. 1811 to 1835. 4to. 21*s.* each.
31. RAMSDEN'S ENGINE for DIVIDING MATHEMATICAL INSTRUMENTS. 4to. 5*s.*
32. ——— ENGINE for DIVIDING STRAIGHT LINES. 4to. 5*s.*
33. SABINE'S PENDULUM EXPERIMENTS to DETERMINE THE FIGURE OF THE EARTH. 1825. 4to. 40*s.*
34. SHEPHERD'S TABLES for CORRECTING LUNAR DISTANCES. 1772. Royal 4to. 21*s.*
35. ——— TABLES, GENERAL, of the MOON'S DISTANCE from the SUN, and 10 STARS. 1787. Folio. 5*s.* 6*d.*
36. TAYLOR'S SEXAGESIMAL TABLE. 1780. 4to. 15*s.*
37. ——— TABLES OF LOGARITHMS. 4to. 3*l.*
38. TIARK'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS for the LONGITUDE of MADEIRA. 1822. 4to. 5*s.*
39. ——— CHRONOMETRICAL OBSERVATIONS for DIFFERENCES of LONGITUDE between DOVER, PORTSMOUTH, and FALMOUTH. 1823. 4to. 5*s.*
40. VENUS and JUPITER: OBSERVATIONS of, compared with the TABLES. *London*, 1822. 4to. 2*s.*
41. WALES' AND BAYLY'S ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS. 1777. 4to. 21*s.*
42. WALES' REDUCTION OF ASTRONOMICAL OBSERVATIONS MADE IN THE SOUTHERN HEMISPHERE. 1764—1771. 1788. 4to. 10*s.* 6*d.*

BABBAGE'S (CHARLES) Economy of Machinery and Manufactures. *Fourth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

——— Ninth Bridgewater Treatise. 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

——— Reflections on the Decline of Science in England, and on some of its Causes. 4to. 7*s.* 6*d.*

——— Views of the Industry, the Science, and the Government of England, 1851. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BAIKIE'S (W. B.) Narrative of an Exploring Voyage up the Rivers Quorra and Tshadda in 1854. Map. 8vo. 16*s.*

BANKES' (GEORGE) STORY OF CORFE CASTLE, with documents relating to the Time of the Civil Wars, &c. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

BASSOMPIERRE'S Memoirs of his Embassy to the Court of England in 1626. Translated with Notes. 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

BARROW'S (SIR JOHN) Autobiographical Memoir, including Reflections, Observations, and Reminiscences at Home and Abroad. From Early Life to Advanced Age. Portrait. 8vo. 16*s.*

——— Voyages of Discovery and Research within the Arctic Regions, from 1818 to the present time. Abridged and arranged from the Official Narratives. 8vo. 15*s.*

——— (SIR GEORGE) Ceylon; Past and Present. Map. Post 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

——— (JOHN) Naval Worthies of Queen Elizabeth's Reign, their Gallant Deeds, Daring Adventures, and Services in the infant state of the British Navy. 8vo. 14*s.*

——— Life and Voyages of Sir Francis Drake. With numerous Original Letters. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

BEES AND FLOWERS. Two Essays. By Rev. Thomas James. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.* each.

BELL'S (SIR CHARLES) Mechanism and Vital Endowments of the Hand as evincing Design. *Sixth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BENEDICT'S (JULES) Sketch of the Life and Works of Felix Mendelssohn Bartholdy. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

BERTHA'S Journal during a Visit to her Uncle in England. Containing a Variety of Interesting and Instructive Information. *Seventh Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BIRCH'S (SAMUEL) History of Ancient Pottery and Porcelain: Egyptian, Assyrian, Greek, Roman, and Etruscan. With 200 Illustrations. 2 Vols. Medium 8vo. 42*s.*

BLUNT'S (REV. J. J.) Principles for the proper understanding of the Mosaic Writings, stated and applied, together with an Incidental Argument for the truth of the Resurrection of our Lord. Being the HULSEAN LECTURES for 1832. Post 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

——— Undesigned Coincidences in the Writings of the Old and New Testament, an Argument of their Veracity: with an Appendix containing Undesigned Coincidences between the Gospels, Acts, and Josephus. *Sixth Edition.* Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

——— History of the Church in the First Three Centuries. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

——— Parish Priest; His Duties, Acquirements and Obligations. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

——— Lectures on the Right Use of the Early Fathers. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 15*s.*

——— Plain Sermons Preached to a Country Congregation. *Second Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* each.

BLACKSTONE'S (Sir William) Commentaries on the Laws of England. A New Edition, adapted to the present state of the law. By R. Malcolm Kerr, LL.D. 4 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

——— (The Student's Blackstone:) Being those Portions of the above work which relate to the British Constitution and the Rights of Persons. By R. Malcolm Kerr, LL.D. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

BLAINE (Robertson) on the Laws of Artistic Copyright and their Defects, for Artists, Engravers, Printsellers, &c. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER. With 1000 Illustrations of Borders, Initials, and Woodcut Vignettes. *A New Edition.* Medium 8vo. 21*s. cloth,* 31*s.* 6*d. calf,* or 42*s. morocco.*

BOSWELL'S (James) Life of Dr. Johnson. Including the Tour to the Hebrides. Edited by Mr. Croker. *Third Edition.* Portraits. Royal 8vo. 15*s.*

BORROW'S (George) Lavengro; The Scholar—The Gipsy—and the Priest. Portrait. 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 30*s.*

——— Romany Rye; a Sequel to Lavengro. *Second Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.*

——— Bible in Spain; or the Journeys, Adventures, and Imprisonments of an Englishman in an Attempt to circulate the Scriptures in the Peninsula. 3 Vols. Post 8vo. 27*s.*, or *Popular Edition* 16mo, 6*s.*

——— Zincali, or the Gipsies of Spain; their Manners, Customs, Religion, and Language. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*, or *Popular Edition,* 16mo, 6*s.*

BRAY'S (Mrs.) Life of Thomas Stothard, R.A. With Personal Reminiscences. Illustrated with Portrait and 60 Woodcuts of his chief works. 4to.

BREWSTER'S (Sir David) Martyrs of Science, or the Lives of Galileo, Tycho Brahe, and Kepler. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

——— More Worlds than One. The Creed of the Philosopher and the Hope of the Christian. *Seventh Thousand.* Post 8vo. 6*s.*

——— Stereoscope: its History, Theory, Construction, and Application to the Arts and to Education. Woodcuts. 12mo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

——— Kaleidoscope: its History, Theory, and Construction, with its application to the Fine and Useful Arts. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

BRITISH ASSOCIATION REPORTS. 8vo. York and Oxford, 1831-32, 13*s.* 6*d.* Cambridge, 1833, 12*s.* Edinburgh, 1834, 15*s.* Dublin, 1835, 13*s.* 6*d.* Bristol, 1836, 12*s.* Liverpool, 1837, 16*s.* 6*d.* Newcastle, 1838, 15*s.* Birmingham, 1839, 13*s.* 6*d.* Glasgow, 1840, 15*s.* Plymouth, 1841, 13*s.* 6*d.* Manchester, 1842, 10*s.* 6*d.* Cork, 1843, 12*s.* York, 1844. 20*s.* Cambridge, 1845. 12*s.* Southampton, 1846, 15*s.* Oxford, 1847, 18*s.* Swansea, 1848, 9*s.* Birmingham, 1849, 10*s.* Edinburgh, 1850, 15*s.* Ipswich, 1851, 16*s.* 6*d.* Belfast, 1852, 15*s.* Hull, 1853, 10*s.* 6*d.* Liverpool, 1854, 18*s.* Glasgow, 1855, 15*s.*; Cheltenham 1856, 18*s*; Dublin, 1857, 15*s.*

BRITISH CLASSICS. A New Series of Standard English Authors, printed from the most correct text, and edited with elucidatory notes. Published occasionally in demy 8vo. Volumes.

Already Published.

GOLDSMITH'S WORKS. Edited by PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A. Vignettes. 4 Vols. 30*s.*

GIBBON'S DECLINE AND FALL OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE. Edited by WILLIAM SMITH, LL.D. Portrait and Maps. 8 Vols. 60*s.*

JOHNSON'S LIVES OF THE ENGLISH POETS. Edited by PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A. 3 Vols. 22*s.* 6*d.*

BYRON'S POETICAL WORKS. Edited, with Notes. 6 vols. 45*s.*

In Preparation.

WORKS OF POPE. Edited, with Notes.

WORKS OF DRYDEN. Edited, with Notes.

HUME'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. Edited, with Notes.

LIFE, LETTERS, AND JOURNALS OF SWIFT. Edited, with Notes, by JOHN FORSTER.

WORKS OF SWIFT. Edited, with Notes. By JOHN FORSTER.

WORKS OF ADDISON. Edited, with Notes. By Rev. W. ELWIN.

BROUGHTON'S (LORD) Journey through Albania and other Provinces of Turkey in Europe and Asia, to Constantinople, 1809—10. *Second Edition.* Maps and Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

———— ITALY: Remarks made in several Visits from the Year 1816 to 1854. 2 vols. Post 8vo.

BUBBLES FROM THE BRUNNEN OF NASSAU. By an Old MAN. *Sixth Edition.* 16mo. 5*s.*

BUNBURY'S (C. J. F.) Journal of a Residence at the Cape of Good Hope; with Excursions into the Interior, and Notes on the Natural History and Native Tribes of the Country. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

BUNYAN (JOHN) and Oliver Cromwell. Select Biographies. By ROBERT SOUTHEY. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

BUONAPARTE'S (NAPOLEON) Confidential Correspondence with his Brother Joseph, sometime King of Spain. *Second Edition.* 2 vols. 8vo. 26*s.*

BURGHERSH'S (LORD) Memoir of the Operations of the Allied Armies under Prince Schwarzenberg and Marshal Blucher during the latter end of 1813—14. 8vo. 21*s.*

———— Early Campaigns of the Duke of Wellington in Portugal and Spain. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

BURGON'S (Rev. J. W.) Portrait of a Christian Gentleman: a Memoir of the late Patrick Fraser Tytler, author of "The History of Scotland." 8vo. *In the Press.*

BURN'S (LIEUT-COL.) French and English Dictionary of Naval and Military Technical Terms. *Third Edition.* Crown 8vo. 15*s.*

BURNS' (ROBERT) Life. By JOHN GIBSON LOCKHART. Fifth *Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.*

BURR'S (G. D.) Instructions in Practical Surveying, Topographical Plan Drawing, and on sketching ground without Instruments. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

BUXTON'S (Sir Fowell) Memoirs. With Selections from his Correspondence. By his Son. *Fifth Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*; or, *Popular Edition.* Post 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

BYRON'S (Lord) Life, Letters, and Journals. By Thomas Moore. *Cabinet Edition.* Plates. 6 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 18*s.*

——— Life, Letters, and Journals. By Thomas Moore. *Popular Edition.* Portrait and Vignette. One Volume, royal 8vo. 12*s.*

——— Poetical Works. *Library Edition.* Portrait. 6 Vols. Demy 8vo. 45*s.*

——— Poetical Works. *Cabinet Edition.* Plates. 10 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 30*s.*

——— Poetical Works. *People's Edition.* Portrait and Steel Engravings. Royal 8vo. 9*s.*

——— Poetical Works. *Travelling Edition.* Printed in small but beautifully clear type. Portrait. Crown 8vo. 9*s.*

——— Poetical Works. *Pocket Edition. Containing* Childe Harold; Dramas, 2 Vols.; Tales and Poems; Miscellanies, 2 Vols.; Beppo and Don Juan, 2 Vols. 8 Vols. 24mo. 20*s.* Or, *separately*, 2*s.* 6*d.* Each volume.

——— Childe Harold's Pilgrimage. A New and beautifully printed Edition. Illustrated, with Wood Engravings, from original Drawings by Percival Skelton. Fcap. 4to. 21*s.*

——— Illustrated with 30 Steel Vignettes. Crown 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

BYRON Beauties. Poetry and Prose. A Reading Book for Youth. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

CALVIN'S (John) Life. With Extracts from his Correspondence. By Thomas H. Dyer. Portrait. 8vo. 15*s.*

CALLCOTT'S (Lady) Little Arthur's History of England. 18*th Edition.* With 20 Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

CARMICHAEL'S (A. N.) Greek Verbs. Their Formations, Irregularities, and Defects. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

CARNARVON'S (Lord) Portugal, Gallicia, and the Basque Provinces. From Notes made during a Journey to those Countries. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 6*s.*

CAMPBELL'S (Lord) Lives of the Lord Chancellors and Keepers of the Great Seal of England. From the Earliest Times to the Death of Lord Eldon in 1838. *4th Edition.* 10 Vols. Crown 8vo. 6*s.* each.

——— Life of Lord Chancellor Bacon. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Lives of the Chief Justices of England. From the Norman Conquest to the Death of Lord Tenterden. *Second Edition.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

——— (George) Modern India. A Sketch of the System of Civil Government. With some Account of the Natives and Native Institutions. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

——— India as it may be. An Outline of a proposed Government and Policy. 8vo. 12*s.*

——— (Thos.) Short Lives of the British Poets. With an Essay on English Poetry. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

CASTLEREAGH (THE) DESPATCHES, from the commencement of the official career of the late Viscount Castlereagh to the close of his life. Edited by the MARQUIS OF LONDONDERRY. 12 Vols. 8vo. 14*s.* each.

CATHCART'S (SIR GEORGE) Commentaries on the War in Russia and Germany, 1812-13. Plans. 8vo. 14*s.*

——— Military Operations in Kaffraria, which led to the Termination of the Kaffir War. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12*s.*

CAVALCASELLE (G. B.) Notices of the Early Flemish Painters; Their Lives and Works. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

CHANTREY (SIR FRANCIS). Winged Words on Chantrey's Woodcocks. Edited by JAS. P. MUIRHEAD. Etchings. Square 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

CHARMED ROE (THE); or, The Story of the Little Brother and Sister. By OTTO SPECKTER. Plates. 16mo. 5*s.*

CLARENDON (LORD CHANCELLOR); Lives of his Friends and Contemporaries, illustrative of Portraits in his Gallery. By Lady THERESA LEWIS. Portraits. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

CLAUSEWITZ'S (CARL VON) Campaign of 1812, in Russia. Translated from the German by LORD ELLESMERE. Map. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

CLIVE'S (LORD) Life. By REV. G. R. GLEIG, M.A. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

COLERIDGE (SAMUEL TAYLOR). Specimens of his Table-Talk. *Fourth Edition.* Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

——— (HENRY NELSON) Introductions to the Study of the Greek Classic Poets. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

COLONIAL LIBRARY. [See Home and Colonial Library.]

COOKERY (DOMESTIC). Founded on Principles of Economy and Practical Knowledge, and adapted for Private Families. *New Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

CORNWALLIS (THE) Papers and Correspondence during the American War,—Administrations in India,—Union with Ireland, and Peace of Amiens. From Family Papers, &c. Edited by CHARLES ROSS. 3 Vols. 8vo. 63*s.*

CRABBE'S (REV. GEORGE) Life, Letters, and Journals. By his SON. Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.*

——— and Poetical Works. *Cabinet Edition.* Plates. 8 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 24*s.*

——— and Poetical Works. *Popular Edition.* Plates. One Volume. Royal 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

CRAIK'S (G. L.) Pursuit of Knowledge under Difficulties. *New Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

CURZON'S (HON. ROBERT) Visits to the Monasteries of the Levant. *Fourth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 15*s.*

——— ARMENIA AND ERZEROUM. A Year on the Frontiers of Russia, Turkey, and Persia. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

CUNNINGHAM'S (ALLAN) Life of Sir David Wilkie. With his Journals and Critical Remarks on Works of Art. Portrait. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

CUNNINGHAM'S (ALLAN) Poems and Songs. Now first collected and arranged, with Biographical Notice. 24mo. 2s. 6d.

———— (CAPT. J. D.) History of the Sikhs. From the Origin of the Nation to the Battle of the Sutlej. *Second Edition.* Maps. 8vo. 15s.

———— (PETER) London—Past and Present. A Handbook to the Antiquities, Curiosities, Churches, Works of Art, Public Buildings, and Places connected with interesting and historical associations. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 16s.

———— Modern London. A complete Guide for Visitors to the Metropolis. Map. 16mo. 5s.

———— Westminster Abbey. Its Art, Architecture, and Associations. Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

———— Works of Oliver Goldsmith. Edited with Notes. Vignettes. 4 vols. 8vo. 30s. (Murray's British Classics.)

———— Lives of Eminent English Poets. By SAMUEL JOHNSON, LL.D. Edited with Notes. 3 vols. 8vo. 22s. 6d. (Murray's British Classics.)

CROKER'S (J. W.) Progressive Geography for Children. *Fifth Edition.* 18mo. 1s. 6d.

———— Stories for Children, Selected from the History of England. *Fifteenth Edition.* Woodcuts. 16mo. 2s. 6d.

———— Boswell's Life of Johnson. Including the Tour to the Hebrides. *Third Edition.* Portraits. Royal 8vo. 15s.

———— LORD HERVEY'S Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second, from his Accession to the death of Queen Caroline. Edited with Notes. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 21s.

———— Essays on the Early Period of the French Revolution. Reprinted from the Quarterly Review. 8vo. 15s.

———— Historical Essay on the Guillotine. Fcap. 8vo. 1s.

CROMWELL (OLIVER) and John Bunyan. By ROBERT SOUTHEY. Post 8vo. 2s. 6d.

CROWE'S (J. A.) Notices of the Early Flemish Painters; their Lives and Works. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12s.

CURETON (REV. W.) Remains of a very Ancient Recension of the Four Gospels in Syriac, hitherto unknown in Europe. Discovered, Edited, and Translated. 4to. 24s.

DARWIN'S (CHARLES) Journal of Researches into the Natural History and Geology of the Countries visited during a Voyage round the World. Post 8vo. 8s. 6d.

DAVIS'S (SIR J. F.) China: A General Description of that Empire and its Inhabitants, down to 1857. *New Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 14s.

DAVY'S (SIR HUMPHRY) Consolations in Travel; or, Last Days of a Philosopher. *Fifth Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

———— Salmonia; or, Days of Fly Fishing. With some Account of the Habits of Fishes belonging to the genus Salmo. *Fourth Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6s.

DENNIS' (GEORGE) Cities and Cemeteries of Etruria; or, the extant Local Remains of Etruscan Art. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 42s.

DOG-BREAKING; the Most Expeditious, Certain, and Easy Method, whether great excellence or only mediocrity be required. By Lieut.-Col. Hutchinson. *Third Edition.* Revised and enlarged. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

DOMESTIC MODERN COOKERY. Founded on Principles of Economy and Practical Knowledge, and adapted for Private Families. *New Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

DOUGLAS'S (General Sir Howard) Treatise on the Theory and Practice of Gunnery. *Fourth Edition.* Plates. 8vo. 21*s.*

——— Treatise on the Principle and Construction of Military Bridges, and the Passage of Rivers in Military Operations. *Third Edition.* Plates. 8vo. 21*s.*

——— Naval Warfare with Steam. Woodcuts. 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

DRAKE'S (Sir Francis) Life, Voyages, and Exploits, by Sea and Land. By John Barrow. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

DRINKWATER'S (John) History of the Siege of Gibraltar, 1779-1783. With a Description and Account of that Garrison from the Earliest Periods. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

DRYDEN'S (John) Works. A New Edition, based upon Sir Walter Scott's Edition, entirely revised. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

DUDLEY'S (Earl of) Letters to the late Bishop of Llandaff. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

DUFFERIN'S (Lord) Letters from High Latitudes, being some Account of a Yacht Voyage to Iceland, &c., in 1856. *Fourth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

DURHAM'S (Admiral Sir Philip) Naval Life and Services. By Capt. Alexander Murray. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

DYER'S (Thomas H.) Life and Letters of John Calvin. Compiled from authentic Sources. Portrait. 8vo. 15*s.*

——— New History of Modern Europe. From the taking of Constantinople by the Turks to the Close of the War in the Crimea. 4 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

EASTLAKE (Sir Charles) The Schools of Painting in Italy. From the Earliest times. From the German of Kugler. Edited, with Notes. *Third Edition.* Illustrated from the Old Masters. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 30*s.*

EDWARDS' (W. H.) Voyage up the River Amazon, including a Visit to Para. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

EGERTON'S (Hon. Capt. Francis) Journal of a Winter's Tour in India; with a Visit to Nepaul. Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*

ELDON'S (Lord Chancellor) Public and Private Life, with Selections from his Correspondence and Diaries. By Horace Twiss. *Third Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.*

ELIOT'S (Hon. W. G. C.) Khans of the Crimea. Being a Narrative of an Embassy from Frederick the Great to the Court of Krim Gerai. Translated from the German. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

ELLIS (Mrs.) On the Education of Character, with Hints on Moral Training. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

——— (Rev. W.) Three Visits to Madagascar. During 1853,-54, and -56, including a Journey to the Capital, with notices of Natural History, and Present Civilisation of the People. *Fourth Thousand.* Map and Woodcuts. 8vo. 16*s.*

ELLESMERE'S (Lord) Two Sieges of Vienna by the Turks. Translated from the German. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Second Campaign of Radetzky in Piedmont. The Defence of Temeswar and the Camp of the Ban. From the German. Post 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

——— Life and Character of the Duke of Wellington; a Discourse. Fcap. 8vo. 6*d.*

——— Campaign of 1812 in Russia, from the German of General Carl Von Clausewitz. Map. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

——— Pilgrimage, and other Poems. Crown 4to. 21*s.*

——— Essays on History, Biography, Geography, and Engineering. 8vo. 12*s.*

ELPHINSTONE'S (Hon. Mountstuart) History of India—the Hindoo and Mahomedan Periods. *Fourth Edition.* With an Index. Map. 8vo. 18*s.*

ELWIN'S (Rev. W.) Lives of Eminent British Poets. From Chaucer to Wordsworth. 4 Vols. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

ENGLAND (History of) from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles, 1713—83. By Lord Mahon. *Library Edition,* 7 Vols. 8vo, 93*s.*; or, *Popular Edition,* 7 Vols. Post 8vo. 35*s.*

——— From the First Invasion by the Romans, down to the 14th year of Queen Victoria's Reign. By Mrs. Markham. 98*th Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6*s.*

——— As it is: Social, Political, and Industrial, in the 19th Century. By W. Johnston. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*

——— and France under the House of Lancaster. With an Introductory View of the Early Reformation. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 15*s.*

ENGLISHWOMAN IN AMERICA. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

——— ——— RUSSIA: or, Impressions of Manners and Society during a Ten Years' Residence in that Country. *Fifth Thousand.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

ERSKINE'S (Capt., R.N.) Journal of a Cruise among the Islands of the Western Pacific, including the Fejees, and others inhabited by the Polynesian Negro Races. Plates. 8vo. 16*s.*

ESKIMAUX (The) and English Vocabulary, for the use of Travellers in the Arctic Regions. 16mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

ESSAYS FROM "THE TIMES." Being a Selection from the Literary Papers which have appeared in that Journal. *7th Thousand.* 2 vols. Fcap. 8vo. 8*s.*

EXETER'S (Bishop of) Letters to the late Charles Butler, on the Theological parts of his Book of the Roman Catholic Church; with Remarks on certain Works of Dr. Milner and Dr. Lingard, and on some parts of the Evidence of Dr. Doyle. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

FAIRY RING (The), A Collection of Tales and Stories for Young Persons. From the German. By J. E. Taylor. Illustrated by Richard Doyle. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo.

FALKNER'S (Fred.) Muck Manual for the Use of Farmers. A Treatise on the Nature and Value of Manures. *Second Edition,* with a Glossary of Terms and an Index. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

FAMILY RECEIPT-BOOK. A Collection of a Thousand Valuable and Useful Receipts. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

FANCOURT'S (Col.) History of Yucatan, from its Discovery to the Close of the 17th Century. With Map. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

FEATHERSTONHAUGH'S (G. W.) Tour through the Slave States of North America, from the River Potomac, to Texas and the Frontiers of Mexico. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 26*s.*

FELLOWS' (Sir Charles) Travels and Researches in Asia Minor, more particularly in the Province of Lycia. *New Edition.* Plates. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

FERGUSSON'S (James) Palaces of Nineveh and Persepolis Restored: an Essay on Ancient Assyrian and Persian Architecture. With 45 Woodcuts. 8vo. 16*s.*

——— Handbook of Architecture. Being a Concise and Popular Account of the Different Styles prevailing in all Ages and Countries in the World. With a Description of the most remarkable Buildings. *Fourth Thousand.* With 850 Illustrations. 8vo. 26*s.*

FERRIER'S (T. P.) Caravan Journeys in Persia, Affghanistan, Herat, Turkistan, and Beloochistan, with Descriptions of Meshed, Balk, and Candahar, and Sketches of the Nomade Tribes of Central Asia. *Second Edition.* Map. 8vo. 21*s.*

——— History of the Afghans. Map. 8vo. 21*s.*

FEUERBACH'S Remarkable German Crimes and Trials. Translated from the German by Lady Duff Gordon. 8vo. 12*s.*

FISHER'S (Rev. George) Elements of Geometry, for the Use of Schools. *Fifth Edition.* 18mo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

——— First Principles of Algebra, for the Use of Schools. *Fifth Edition.* 18mo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

FLOWER GARDEN (The). An Essay. By Rev. Thos. James. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

FORD'S (Richard) Handbook for Spain, Andalusia, Ronda, Valencia, Catalonia, Granada, Gallicia, Arragon, Navarre, &c. *Third Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 30*s.*

——— Gatherings from Spain. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

FORSTER'S (John) Historical & Biographical Essays. Contents:—

I. The Grand Remonstrance, 1641.
II. The Plantagenets and the Tudors.
III. The Civil Wars and Oliver Cromwell.
IV. Daniel De Foe.
V. Sir Richard Steele.
VI. Charles Churchill.
VII. Samuel Foote.

2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.*

FORSYTH'S (William) Hortensius, or the Advocate: an Historical Essay on the Office and Duties of an Advocate. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— History of Napoleon at St. Helena. From the Letters and Journals of Sir Hudson Lowe. Portrait and Maps. 3 Vols. 8vo. 45*s.*

FORTUNE'S (Robert) Narrative of Two Visits to China, between the years 1843-52, with full Descriptions of the Culture of the Tea Plant. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*

——— Residence among the Chinese: Inland, on the Coast, and at Sea, during 1853-56. Woodcuts. 8vo. 16*s.*

FRANCE (History of). From the Conquest by the Gauls to the Death of Louis Philippe. By Mrs. Markham. *56th Thousand.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6*s.*

FRENCH (The) in Algiers; The Soldier of the Foreign Legion—and the Prisoners of Abd-el-Kadir. Translated by Lady Duff Gordon. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

GALTON'S (Francis) Art of Travel; or, Hints on the Shifts and Contrivances available in Wild Countries. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

GEOGRAPHICAL (The) Journal. Published by the Royal Geographical Society of London. 8vo.

GERMANY (History of). From the Invasion by Marius, to the present time. On the plan of Mrs. Markham. *Ninth Thousand.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6*s.*

GIBBON'S (Edward) Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. *A New Edition.* Preceded by his Autobiography. Edited with Notes by Dr. Wm. Smith. Maps. 8 Vols. 8vo. 60*s.*

———— The Student's Gibbon; Being the History of the Decline and Fall, Abridged, incorporating the Researches of Recent Commentators. By Dr. Wm. Smith. *Sixth Thousand.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

GIFFARD'S (Edward) Deeds of Naval Daring; or, Anecdotes of the British Navy. 2 Vols. Fcap. 8vo.

GISBORNE'S (Thomas) Essays on Agriculture. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo.

GLADSTONE'S (W. E.) Prayers arranged from the Liturgy for Family Use. *Second Edition.* 12mo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

GOLDSMITH'S (Oliver) Works. A New Edition. Printed from the last editions revised by the Author. Edited by Peter Cunningham. Vignettes. 4 Vols. 8vo. 30*s.* (Murray's British Classics.)

GLEIG'S (Rev. G. R.) Campaigns of the British Army at Washington and New Orleans. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

———— Story of the Battle of Waterloo. Compiled from Public and Authentic Sources. Post 8vo. 5*s.*

———— Narrative of Sir Robert Sale's Brigade in Afghanistan, with an Account of the Seizure and Defence of Jellalabad. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

———— Life of Robert Lord Clive. Post 8vo. 5*s.*

———— Life and Letters of General Sir Thomas Munro. Post 8vo. 5*s.*

GORDON'S (Sir Alex. Duff) Sketches of German Life, and Scenes from the War of Liberation. From the German. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

———— (Lady Duff) Amber-Witch: the most interesting Trial for Witchcraft ever known. From the German. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

———— French in Algiers. 1. The Soldier of the Foreign Legion. 2. The Prisoners of Abd-el-Kadir. From the French. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

————Remarkable German Crimes and Trials. From the German of Fuerbach. 8vo. 12*s.*

GRANT'S (Asahel) Nestorians, or the Lost Tribes; containing Evidence of their Identity, their Manners, Customs, and Ceremonies; with Sketches of Travel in Ancient Assyria, Armenia, and Mesopotamia; and Illustrations of Scripture Prophecy. *Third Edition.* Fcap 8vo. 6*s.*

GRENVILLE (THE) PAPERS. Being the Public and Private Correspondence of George Grenville, his Friends and Contemporaries, during a period of 30 years.—Including his DIARY OF POLITICAL EVENTS while First Lord of the Treasury. Edited, with Notes, by W. J. SMITH. 4 Vols. 8vo. 16*s.* each.

GREEK GRAMMAR FOR SCHOOLS. Abridged from Matthiæ. By the BISHOP OF LONDON. *Ninth Edition*, revised by Rev. J. EDWARDS. 12mo. 3*s.*

GREY'S (SIR GEORGE) Polynesian Mythology, and Ancient Traditional History of the New Zealand Race. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

GROTE'S (GEORGE) History of Greece. From the Earliest Times to the close of the generation contemporary with the death of Alexander the Great. *Third Edition.* Maps and Index. 12 vols. 8vo. 16*s.* each.

GROSVENOR'S (LORD ROBERT) Leaves from my Journal during the Summer of 1851. *Second Edition.* Plates. Post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

GUSTAVUS VASA (History of), King of Sweden. With Extracts from his Correspondence. Portrait. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

HALLAM'S (HENRY) Constitutional History of England, from the Accession of Henry the Seventh to the Death of George the Second. *Seventh Edition.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

——— History of Europe during the Middle Ages. *Tenth Edition.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

——— Introduction to the Literary History of Europe, during the 16th, 17th, and 18th Centuries. *Fourth Edition.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

——— Literary Essays and Characters. Selected from the last work. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.*

——— Historical Works. Containing the History of England,—The Middle Ages of Europe,—and the Literary History of Europe. *Complete Edition.* 10 Vols. Post 8vo. 6*s.* each.

HAMILTON'S (JAMES) Wanderings in Northern Africa, Benghazi, Cyrene, the Oasis of Siwah, &c. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— (WALTER) Hindostan, Geographically, Statistically, and Historically. Map. 2 Vols. 4to. 94*s.* 6*d.*

HAMPDEN'S (BISHOP) Essay on the Philosophical Evidence of Christianity, or the Credibility obtained to a Scripture Revelation from its Coincidence with the Facts of Nature. 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

HARCOURT'S (EDWARD VERNON) Sketch of Madeira; with Map and Plates. Post 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

HART'S ARMY LIST. (*Quarterly and Annually.*) 8vo.

HAY'S (J. H. DRUMMOND) Western Barbary, its wild Tribes and savage Animals. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

HEBER (BISHOP) Parish Sermons; on the Lessons, the Gospel, or the Epistle, for every Sunday in the Year, and for Week-day Festivals. *Sixth Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 16*s.*

——— Sermons Preached in England. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

——— Hymns written and adapted for the weekly Church Service of the Year. *Twelfth Edition.* 16mo. 2*s.*

——— Poetical Works. *Fifth Edition.* Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

——— Journey through the Upper Provinces of India, From Calcutta to Bombay, with a Journey to Madras and the Southern Provinces. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

HAND-BOOK OF TRAVEL-TALK; or, Conversations in English, German, French, and Italian. 18mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

——— NORTH GERMANY—Holland, Belgium, and the Rhine to Switzerland. Map. Post 8vo. 10*s.*

——— SOUTH GERMANY—Bavaria, Austria, Salzberg, the Austrian and Bavarian Alps, the Tyrol, and the Danube, from Ulm to the Black Sea. Map. Post 8vo. 10*s.*

——— PAINTING—the German, Flemish, and Dutch Schools: From the German of Kugler. *A New Edition.* Edited by Dr. Waagen. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. (*In the Press.*)

——— SWITZERLAND—the Alps of Savoy, and Piedmont. Maps. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

——— FRANCE—Normandy, Brittany, the French Alps, the Rivers Loire, Seine, Rhone, and Garonne, Dauphiné, Provence, and the Pyrenees. Maps. Post 8vo. 10*s.*

——— SPAIN—Andalusia, Ronda, Granada, Valencia, Catalonia, Gallicia, Arragon, and Navarre. Maps. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 30*s.*

——— PORTUGAL, LISBON, &c. Map. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

——— PAINTING—Spanish and French Schools. By Sir Edmund Head, Bart. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— NORTH ITALY—Florence, Sardinia, Genoa, the Riviera, Venice, Lombardy, and Tuscany. Map. Post 8vo. 2 Vols. 12*s.*

——— CENTRAL ITALY—South Tuscany and the Papal States. Map. Post 8vo. 7*s.*

——— ROME—AND ITS ENVIRONS. Map. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

——— SOUTH ITALY—Naples, Pompeii, Herculaneum, Vesuvius, &c. Map. Post 8vo. 10*s.*

——— SICILY. Map. Post 8vo. (*In the Press.*)

——— PAINTING—the Italian Schools. From the German of Kugler. Edited by Sir Charles Eastlake, R.A. Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 30*s.*

——— ITALIAN PAINTERS: (A Short Biographical Dictionary of.) With a Chart. Post 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

——— GREECE—the Ionian Islands, Albania, Thessaly, and Macedonia. Maps. Post 8vo. 15*s.*

——— TURKEY—Malta, Asia Minor, Constantinople, Armenia, Mesopotamia, &c. Maps. Post 8vo.

——— EGYPT—Thebes, the Nile, Alexandria, Cairo, the Pyramids, Mount Sinai, &c. Map. Post 8vo. 15*s.*

——— SYRIA AND PALESTINE; the Peninsula of Sinai, Edom, and the Syrian Desert. Maps. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 24*s.*

——— INDIA.—Part 1. Bombay and Madras. Map. 2 Parts. Post 8vo.

——— DENMARK—Norway and Sweden. Maps. Post 8vo. 15*s.*

——— RUSSIA—The Baltic and Finland. Maps. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

HANDBOOK OF LONDON, PAST AND PRESENT. Alphabetically arranged. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 16*s.*

——— MODERN LONDON. A Guide to all objects of interest in the Metropolis. Map. 16mo. 5*s.*

——— ENVIRONS OF LONDON. Including a Circle of 30 Miles round St. Paul's. Maps. Post 8vo. (*In preparation.*)

——— DEVON AND CORNWALL. Maps. Post 8vo.

——— WILTS, DORSET, AND SOMERSET. Map. Post 8vo.

——— KENT AND SUSSEX. Map. Post 8vo. 10*s.*

——— SURREY, HANTS, and the Isle of Wight. Maps. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

——— WESTMINSTER ABBEY—its Art, Architecture, and Associations. Woodcuts. 16mo. 1*s.*

——— CATHEDRALS OF ENGLAND. Post 8vo. *In Preparation.*

——— PARIS. Post 8vo. (*In Preparation.*)

——— FAMILIAR QUOTATIONS. Chiefly from English Authors. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

——— ARCHITECTURE. Being a Concise and Popular Account of the Different Styles prevailing in all Ages and Countries. By JAMES FERGUSSON. *Fourth Thousand.* With 850 Illustrations. 8vo. 26*s.*

——— ARTS OF THE MIDDLE AGES AND RENAISSANCE. By M. Jules Labarte. With 200 Illustrations. 8vo. 18*s.*

HEAD'S (SIR FRANCIS) Rough Notes of some Rapid Journeys across the Pampas and over the Andes. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Descriptive Essays: contributed to the "Quarterly Review." 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*

——— Bubbles from the Brunnen of Nassau. By an OLD MAN. *Sixth Edition.* 16mo. 5*s.*

——— Emigrant. *Sixth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Stokers and Pokers; or, the London and North-Western Railway. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Defenceless State of Great Britain. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— Faggot of French Sticks; or, Sketches of Paris. *New Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— Fortnight in Ireland. *Second Edition.* Map. 8vo. 12*s.*

——— (SIR GEORGE) Forest Scenes and Incidents in Canada. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 10*s.*

——— Home Tour through the Manufacturing Districts of England, Scotland, and Ireland, including the Channel Islands, and the Isle of Man. *Third Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— (SIR EDMUND) Handbook of Painting—the Spanish and French Schools. With Illustrations. Post 8vo.

——— Shall and Will; or, Two Chapters on Future Auxiliary Verbs. *Second Edition, Enlarged.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.*

HEIRESS (The) in Her Minority; or, The Progress of Character. By the Author of "Bertha's Journal." 2 Vols. 12mo. 18*s.*

HERODOTUS. A New English Version. Edited with Notes, and Essays. By Rev. G. Rawlinson, assisted by Sir Henry Rawlinson, and Sir J. G. Wilkinson. Maps and Woodcuts. 4 Vols. 8vo. 18*s. each.*

HERVEY'S (Lord) Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second, from his Accession to the Death of Queen Caroline. Edited, with Notes by Mr. Croker. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 21*s.*

HICKMAN'S (Wm.) Treatise on the Law and Practice of Naval Courts Martial. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

HILLARD'S (G. S.) Six Months in Italy. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 16*s.*

HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND FRANCE under the House of Lancaster. With an Introductory View of the Early Reformation. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 15*s.*

HOLLAND'S (Rev. W. B.) Psalms and Hymns, selected and adapted to the various Solemnities of the Church. *Third Edition.* 24mo. 1*s.* 3*d.*

HOLLWAY'S (J. G.) Month in Norway. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.*

HONEY BEE (The). An Essay. By Rev. Thomas James. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

HOOK'S (Rev. Dr.) Church Dictionary. *Eighth Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

——— Discourses on the Religious Controversies of the Day. 8vo. 9*s.*

——— (Theodore) Life. By J. G. Lockhart. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

HOOKER'S (Dr. J. D.) Himalayan Journals; or, Notes of an Oriental Naturalist in Bengal, the Sikkim and Nepal Himalayas, the Khasia Mountains, &c. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*

HOOPER'S (Lieut.) Ten Months among the Tents of the Tuski; with Incidents of an Arctic Boat Expedition in Search of Sir John Franklin. Plates, 8vo. 14*s.*

HORACE (Works of). Edited by Dean Milman. With 300 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 21*s.*

——— (Life of). By Dean Milman. Woodcuts, and coloured Borders. 8vo. 9*s.*

HOSPITALS AND SISTERHOODS. By a Lady. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

HOUSTOUN'S (Mrs.) Yacht Voyage to Texas and the Gulf of Mexico. Plates. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.*

HOME AND COLONIAL LIBRARY. Complete in 70 Parts.

Post 8vo, 2s. 6d. each, or bound in 34 Volumes, cloth.

CONTENTS OF THE SERIES.

THE BIBLE IN SPAIN. By GEORGE BORROW.
JOURNALS IN INDIA. By BISHOP HEBER.
TRAVELS IN THE HOLY LAND. By CAPTAINS IRBY and MANGLES.
THE SIEGE OF GIBRALTAR. By JOHN DRINKWATER.
MOROCCO AND THE MOORS. By J. DRUMMOND HAY.
LETTERS FROM THE BALTIC. By a LADY.
THE AMBER-WITCH. By LADY DUFF GORDON.
OLIVER CROMWELL & JOHN BUNYAN. By ROBERT SOUTHEY.
NEW SOUTH WALES. By MRS. MEREDITH.
LIFE OF SIR FRANCIS DRAKE. By JOHN BARROW.
FATHER RIPA'S MEMOIRS OF THE COURT OF CHINA.
A RESIDENCE IN THE WEST INDIES. By M. G. LEWIS.
SKETCHES OF PERSIA. By SIR JOHN MALCOLM.
THE FRENCH IN ALGIERS. By LADY DUFF GORDON.
VOYAGE OF A NATURALIST. By CHARLES DARWIN.
HISTORY OF THE FALL OF THE JESUITS.
LIFE OF LOUIS PRINCE OF CONDÉ. By LORD MAHON.
GIPSIES OF SPAIN. By GEORGE BORROW.
THE MARQUESAS. By HERMANN MELVILLE.
LIVONIAN TALES. By a LADY.
MISSIONARY LIFE IN CANADA. By REV. J. ABBOTT.
SALE'S BRIGADE IN AFFGHANISTAN. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
LETTERS FROM MADRAS. By a LADY.
HIGHLAND SPORTS. By CHARLES ST. JOHN.
JOURNEYS ACROSS THE PAMPAS. By SIR F. B. HEAD.
GATHERINGS FROM SPAIN. By RICHARD FORD.
SIEGES OF VIENNA BY THE TURKS. By LORD ELLESMERE.
SKETCHES OF GERMAN LIFE. By SIR A. GORDON.
ADVENTURES IN THE SOUTH SEAS. By HERMANN MELVILLE.
STORY OF BATTLE OF WATERLOO. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
A VOYAGE UP THE RIVER AMAZON. By W. H. EDWARDS.
THE WAYSIDE CROSS. By CAPT. MILMAN.
MANNERS & CUSTOMS OF INDIA. By REV. C. ACLAND.
CAMPAIGNS AT WASHINGTON. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
ADVENTURES IN MEXICO. By G. F. RUXTON.
PORTUGAL AND GALLICIA. By LORD CARNARVON.
LIFE OF LORD CLIVE. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
BUSH LIFE IN AUSTRALIA. By H. W. HAYGARTH.
THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF HENRY STEFFENS.
SHORT LIVES OF THE POETS. By THOMAS CAMPBELL.
HISTORICAL ESSAYS. By LORD MAHON.
LONDON & NORTH-WESTERN RAILWAY. By SIR F. B. HEAD.
ADVENTURES IN THE LIBYAN DESERT. By BAYLE ST. JOHN.
A RESIDENCE AT SIERRA LEONE. By a LADY.
LIFE OF GENERAL MUNRO. By REV. G. R. GLEIG.
MEMOIRS OF SIR FOWELL BUXTON. By his SON.

HUME (The Student's). A History of England, from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar. By David Hume; abridged and continued to the Present Time. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* (*Uniform with The Student's Gibbon.*)

HUTCHINSON (Colonel) on Dog-Breaking; the most expeditious, certain, and easy Method, whether great Excellence or only Mediocrity be required. *Third Edition.* Revised and enlarged. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

IRBY AND MANGLES' Travels in Egypt, Nubia, Syria, and the Holy Land, including a Journey round the Dead Sea, and through the Country east of the Jordan. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

JAMES' (Rev. Thomas) Fables of Æsop. A New Translation, with Historical Preface. With 100 Woodcuts by Tenniel and Wolf. *Twenty-sixth Thousand.* Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

JAMESON'S (Mrs.) Memoirs of the Early Italian Painters, and of the Progress of Italian Painting in Italy. *Tenth Edition.* With 70 Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

JAPAN AND THE JAPANESE. Described from the Accounts of Recent Dutch Travellers. *New Edition.* Post 8vo. 6*s.*

JARDINE'S (David) Narrative of the Gunpowder Plot. *New Edition.* Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

JERVIS'S (Capt.) Manual of Operations in the Field, for the Use of Officers. Post 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

JESSE'S (Edward) Favorite Haunts and Rural Studies; or Visits to Spots of Interest in the Vicinity of Windsor and Eton. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— Scenes and Occupations of Country Life. With Recollections of Natural History. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

——— Gleanings in Natural History. With Anecdotes of the Sagacity and Instinct of Animals. *Eighth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

JOHNSON'S (Dr. Samuel) Life: By James Boswell. Including the Tour to the Hebrides, with Notes by Sir W. Scott. Edited by the late Mr. Croker. *Third Edition.* Portraits. Royal 8vo. 15*s.*

——— Lives of the most eminent English Poets. A New Edition. Edited by Peter Cunningham. 3 vols. 8vo. 22*s.* 6*d.* (Murray's British Classics.)

JOHNSTON'S (Wm.) England as it is: Social, Political, and Industrial, in the Middle of the 19th Century. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*

JOURNAL OF A NATURALIST. *Fourth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

JOWETT'S (Rev. B.) Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, and Romans. With Notes and Dissertations. *Second Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo.

KEN'S (Bishop) Life. By A Layman. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18*s.*

KEN'S (Bishop) Exposition of the Apostles' Creed. Extracted from his "Practice of Divine Love." *New Edition.* Fcap. 1*s.* 6*d.*

——— Approach to the Holy Altar. Extracted from his "Manual of Prayer" and "Practice of Divine Love." *New Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

KING'S (Rev. S. W.) Italian Valleys of the Alps; a Tour through all the Romantic and less-frequented "Vals" of Northern Piedmont, from the Tarentaise to the Gries. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 18*s.*

KING EDWARD VIth's Latin Grammar; or, an Introduction to the Latin Tongue, for the Use of Schools. 12*th Edition.* 12mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

——— First Latin Book; or, the Accidence, Syntax and Prosody, with an English Translation for the Use of Junior Classes. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 2*s.*

KNAPP'S (J. A.) English Roots and Ramifications; or, the Derivation and Meaning of Divers Words. Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.*

KUGLER'S (Dr. Franz) Handbook to the History of Painting (the Italian Schools). Translated from the German. Edited, with Notes, by Sir Charles Eastlake. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 30*s.*

——— (the German, Dutch, and Flemish Schools). Translated from the German. *A New Edition.* Edited, with Notes. By Dr. Waagen. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. *Nearly Ready.*

LABARTE'S (M. Jules) Handbook of the Arts of the Middle Ages and Renaissance. With 200 Woodcuts. 8vo. 18*s.*

LABORDE'S (Leon De) Journey through Arabia Petræa, to Mount Sinai, and the Excavated City of Petræa,—the Edom of the Prophecies. *Second Edition.* With Plates. 8vo. 18*s.*

LANE'S (E. W.) Arabian Nights. Translated from the Arabic, with Explanatory Notes. *A New Edition.* Edited by E. Stanley Poole. With 600 Woodcuts. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

LATIN GRAMMAR (King Edward the VIth's.) For the Use of Schools. *Twelfth Edition.* 12mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

——— First Book (King Edward VI.); or, the Accidence, Syntax, and Prosody, with English Translation for Junior Classes. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 2*s.*

LAYARD'S (A. H.) Nineveh and its Remains. Being a Narrative of Researches and Discoveries amidst the Ruins of Assyria. With an Account of the Chaldean Christians of Kurdistan; the Yezedis, or Devil-worshippers; and an Enquiry into the Manners and Arts of the Ancient Assyrians. *Sixth Edition.* Plates and Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

——— Nineveh and Babylon; being the Result of a Second Expedition to Assyria. *Fourteenth Thousand.* Plates. 8vo. 21*s.* Or Fine Paper, 2 Vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

——— Popular Account of Nineveh. 15*th Edition.* With Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 5*s.*

LESLIE'S (C. R.) Handbook for Young Painters. With Illustrations. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

——— Life of Sir Joshua Reynolds. With an Account of his Works, and a Sketch of his Cotemporaries. Fcap. 4to. *In the Press.*

LEAKE'S (Col. W. Martin) Topography of Athens, with Remarks on its Antiquities; to which is added, the Demi of Attica. *Second Edition.* Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

——— Travels in Northern Greece. Maps. 4 Vols. 8vo. 60*s.*

——— Disputed Questions of Ancient Geography. Map. 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

——— Numismata Hellenica. A Catalogue of Greek Coins. With Map and Appendix. 4to. 63*s.*

——— Peloponnesiaca: A Supplement to Travels in the Morea. 8vo. 15*s.*

——— Thoughts on the Degradation of Science in England. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

LETTERS FROM THE SHORES OF THE BALTIC. By a Lady. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Madras; or, First Impressions of Life and Manners in India. By a Lady. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Sierra Leone, written to Friends at Home. By a Lady. Edited by Mrs. Norton. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

——— Head Quarters; or, The Realities of the War in the Crimea. By a Staff Officer. *Popular Edition.* Plans. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

LEXINGTON (The) PAPERS; or, Some Account of the Courts of London and Vienna at the end of the 17th Century. Edited by Hon. H. Manners Sutton. 8vo. 14*s.*

LEWIS' (Sir G. C.) Essay on the Government of Dependencies. 8vo. 12*s.*

——— Glossary of Provincial Words used in Herefordshire and some of the adjoining Counties. 12mo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

——— (Lady Theresa) Friends and Contemporaries of the Lord Chancellor Clarendon, illustrative of Portraits in his Gallery. With a Descriptive Account of the Pictures, and Origin of the Collection. Portraits. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

——— (M. G.) Journal of a Residence among the Negroes in the West Indies. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

LIDDELL'S (Dean) History of Rome. From the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. With the History of Literature and Art. *Library Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo. 28*s.*

——— SCHOOL HISTORY OF ROME. Abridged from the Larger Work. *Eighth Thousand.* With 100 Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.* [*Uniform with* Dr. Wm. Smith's History of Greece].

LINDSAY'S (Lord) Lives of the Lindsays; or, a Memoir of the Houses of Crawford and Balcarres. With Extracts from Official Papers and Personal Narratives. *Second Edition.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 24*s.*

——— Report of the Claim of James, Earl of Crawfurd and Balcarres, to the Original Dukedom of Montrose, created in 1488. Folio. 15*s.*

LITTLE ARTHUR'S HISTORY OF ENGLAND. By Lady Callcott. *Eighteenth Edition.* With 20 Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

LIVINGSTONE'S (Rev. Dr.) Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa; including a Sketch of Sixteen Years' Residence in the Interior of Africa, and a Journey from the Cape of Good Hope to Loanda on the West Coast; thence across the Continent, down the River Zambesi, to the Eastern Ocean. *Thirtieth Thousand.* Map, Plates, and Index. 8vo. 21*s.*

LIVONIAN TALES.—The Disponent.—The Wolves.—The Jewess. By the Author of "Letters from the Baltic." Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

LOCKHART'S (J. G.) Ancient Spanish Ballads. Historical and Romantic. Translated, with Notes. *Illustrated Edition.* 4to. 21*s.* Or, *Popular Edition.* Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Life of Robert Burns. *Fifth Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.*

LOUDON'S (Mrs.) Instructions in Gardening for Ladies. With Directions and Calendar of Operations for Every Month. *Eighth Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

——— Modern Botany; a Popular Introduction to the Natural System of Plants. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 6*s.*

LOWE'S (Sir Hudson) Letters and Journals, during the Captivity of Napoleon at St. Helena. By William Forsyth. Portrait. 3 Vols. 8vo. 45*s.*

LUCKNOW: A Lady's Diary of the Siege. Written for Friends at Home. *Fourth Thousand.* Fcap. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

LYELL'S (Sir Charles) Principles of Geology; or, the Modern Changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants considered as illustrative of Geology. *Ninth Edition.* Woodcuts. 8vo. 18*s.*

——— Manual of Elementary Geology; or, the Ancient Changes of the Earth and its Inhabitants illustrated by its Geological Monuments. *Fifth Edition.* Woodcuts. 8vo. 14*s.*

——— Visits to the United States, 1841-46. *Second Edition.* Plates. 4 Vols. Post 8vo. 24*s.*

MAHON'S (Lord) History of England, from the Peace of Utrecht to the Peace of Versailles, 1713—83. *Library Edition.* 7 Vols. 8vo. 93*s.*

——— *Popular Edition.* 7 Vols. Post 8vo. 35*s.*

——— "Forty-Five;" a Narrative of the Rebellion in Scotland. Post 8vo. 3*s.*

——— The Rise of our Indian Empire. Being the History of British India from its Origin till the Peace of 1783. Extracted from his "History of England." Post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

——— History of the War of the Succession in Spain. *Second Edition.* Map. 8vo. 15*s.*

——— Spain under Charles the Second; or, Extracts from the Correspondence of the Hon. Alexander Stanhope, British Minister at Madrid from 1690 to 1700. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

——— Life of Louis Prince of Condé, surnamed the Great. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

——— Life of Belisarius. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

——— Historical and Critical Essays. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

——— Story of Joan of Arc. Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

——— Addresses Delivered at Manchester, Leeds, and Birmingham. Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

M^cCULLOCH'S (J. R.) Collected Edition of RICARDO'S Political Works. With Notes and Memoir. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

MALCOLM'S (SIR JOHN) Sketches of Persia. *Third Edition.* Post 8vo. 6*s.*

MANSEL'S (REV. H. L.) The Limits of Religious Thought Examined. Being the Bampton Lectures for 1858. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 12*s.*

MANTELL'S (GIDEON A.) Thoughts on Animalcules; or, the Invisible World, as revealed by the Microscope. *Second Edition.* Plates. 16mo. 6*s.*

MANUAL OF SCIENTIFIC ENQUIRY, Prepared for the Use of Officers and Travellers. By various Writers. *Third Edition revised.* Maps. Post 8vo. (*Published by order of the Lords of the Admiralty.*)

MARKHAM'S (MRS.) History of England. From the First Invasion by the Romans, down to the fourteenth year of Queen Victoria's Reign. *98th Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6*s.*

———— History of France. From the Conquest by the Gauls, to the Death of Louis Philippe. *58th Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6*s.*

———— History of Germany. From the Invasion by Marius, to the present time. *6th Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 6*s.*

———— School History of Greece. From the Earliest Times of the Roman Conquest. With the History of Literature and Art. By Dr. WM. SMITH. *Sixteenth Thousand.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 7*s.* 6*d.* (*Questions.* 12mo. 2*s.*)

———— School History of Rome, from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. With the History of Literature and Art. By DEAN LIDDELL. *Eighth Thousand.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MARKLAND'S (J. H.) Reverence due to Holy Places. *Third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.*

MARRYAT'S (JOSEPH) History of Modern and Mediæval Pottery and Porcelain. With a Description of the Manufacture, a Glossary, and a List of Monograms. *Second Edition.* Plates and Woodcuts. 8vo. 31*s.* 6*d.*

MATTHIÆ'S (AUGUSTUS) Greek Grammar for Schools. Abridged from the Larger Grammar. By Blomfield. *Ninth Edition.* Revised by EDWARDS. 12mo. 3*s.*

MAUREL'S (JULES) Essay on the Character, Actions, and Writings of the Duke of Wellington. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

MAWE'S (H. L.) Journal of a Passage from the Pacific to the Atlantic, crossing the Andes in the Northern Provinces of Peru, and descending the great River Maranon. 8vo. 12*s.*

MAXIMS AND HINTS for an Angler, and the Miseries of Fishing. By RICHARD PENN. *New Edition.* Woodcuts. 12mo. 1*s.*

MAYO'S (DR.) Pathology of the Human Mind. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

MELVILLE'S (HERMANN) Typee and Omoo; or, Adventures amongst the Marquesas and South Sea Islands. 2 Vols. Post 8vo.

MENDELSSOHN'S (FELIX BARTHOLDY) Life. By JULES BENEDICT. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

MEREDITH'S (MRS. CHARLES) Notes and Sketches of New South Wales, during a Residence from 1839 to 1844. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

———— Tasmania, during a Residence of Nine Years. With Illustrations. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 18*s.*

MERRIFIELD (MRS.) on the Arts of Painting in Oil, Miniature, Mosaic, and Glass; Gilding, Dyeing, and the Preparation of Colours and Artificial Gems, described in several old Manuscripts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30*s.*

MILLS (ARTHUR) India in 1858; A Summary of the Existing Administration—Political, Fiscal, and Judicial; with Laws and Public Documents, from the earliest to the present time. *Second Edition.* With Coloured Revenue Map. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

MITCHELL'S (THOMAS) Plays of Aristophanes. With English Notes. 8vo.—1. CLOUDS, 10*s.*—2. WASPS, 10*s.*—3. FROGS, 15*s.*

MILMAN'S (DEAN) History of Christianity, from the Birth of Christ to the Extinction of Paganism in the Roman Empire. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

————History of Latin Christianity; including that of the Popes to the Pontificate of Nicholas V. *Second Edition.* 6 Vols. 8vo. 72*s.*

———— Character and Conduct of the Apostles considered as an Evidence of Christianity. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

———— Life and Works of Horace. With 300 Woodcuts. *New Edition.* 2 Vols. Crown 8vo. 30*s.*

———— Poetical Works. Plates. 3 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 18*s.*

———— Fall of Jerusalem. Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

———— (CAPT. E. A.) Wayside Cross; or, the Raid of Gomez. A Tale of the Carlist War. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

MODERN DOMESTIC COOKERY. Founded on Principles of Economy and Practical Knowledge, and adapted for Private Families. *New Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

MOLTKE'S (BARON) Russian Campaigns on the Danube and the Passage of the Balkan, 1828—9. Plans. 8vo. 14*s.*

MONASTERY AND THE MOUNTAIN CHURCH. By Author of "Sunlight through the Mist." Woodcuts. 16mo. 4*s.*

MOORE'S (THOMAS) Life and Letters of Lord Byron. *Cabinet Edition.* 6 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 18*s.*

———— Life and Letters of Lord Byron. *Popular Edition.* With Portrait and Vignette. One Volume. Royal 8vo. 12*s.*

MOZLEY'S (REV. J. B.) Treatise on the Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination. 8vo. 14*s.*

————Primitive Doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MUCK MANUAL (The) for the Use of Farmers. A Practical Treatise on the Chemical Properties, Management, and Application of Manures. By FREDERICK FALKNER. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

MUNDY'S (Gen.) Pen and Pencil Sketches during a Tour in India. *Third Edition.* Plates. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

MUNRO'S (General Sir Thomas) Life and Letters. By the Rev. G. R. Gleig. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

MURCHISON'S (Sir Roderick) Russia in Europe and the Ural Mountains; Geologically Illustrated. With Coloured Maps, Plates, Sections, &c. 2 Vols. Royal 4to.

———— Siluria; or, a History of the Oldest Rocks containing Organic Remains. *Second Edition.* Map and Plates. 8vo.

MURRAY'S (Capt. A.) Naval Life and Services of Admiral Sir Philip Durham. 8vo. 5*s.* 6*d.*

MURRAY'S RAILWAY READING. For all classes of Readers.

[*The following are published:*]

Wellington. By Lord Ellesmere. 6*d.*
Nimrod on the Chase. 1*s.*
Essays from "The Times." 2 Vols. 8*s.*
Music and Dress. 1*s.*
Layard's Account of Nineveh. 5*s.*
Milman's Fall of Jerusalem. 1*s.*
Mahon's "Forty-Five." 3*s.*
Life of Theodore Hook. 1*s.*
Deeds of Naval Daring. 2 Vols. 5*s.*
The Honey Bee. 1*s.*
James' Æsop's Fables. 2*s.* 6*d.*
Nimrod on the Turf. 1*s.* 6*d.*
Oliphant's Nepaul. 2*s.* 6*d.*
Art of Dining. 1*s.* 6*d.*
Hallam's Literary Essays. 2*s.*
Mahon's Joan of Arc. 1*s.*
Head's Emigrant. 2*s.* 6*d.*
Nimrod on the Road. 1*s.*
Wilkinson's Ancient Egyptians. 12*s.*
Croker on the Guillotine. 1*s.*
Holloway's Norway. 2*s.*
Maurel's Wellington. 1*s.* 6*d.*
Campbell's Life of Bacon. 2*s.* 6*d.*
The Flower Garden. 1*s.*
Lockhart's Spanish Ballads. 2*s.* 6*d.*
Lucas on History. 6*d.*
Beauties of Byron. 3*s.*
Taylor's Notes from Life. 2*s.*
Rejected Addresses. 1*s.*
Penn's Hints on Angling. 1*s.*

MUSIC AND DRESS. Two Essays, by a Lady. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

NAPIER'S (Sir Wm.) English Battles and Sieges of the Peninsular War. *Third Edition.* Portrait. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

———— Life and Opinions of General Sir Charles Napier; chiefly derived from his Journals, Letters, and Familiar Correspondence. *Second Edition.* Portraits. 4 Vols. Post 8vo. 48*s.*

NAUTICAL ALMANACK (The). Royal 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.* (*Published by Authority.*)

NAVY LIST (The Quarterly). (*Published by Authority.*) Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

NEWBOLD'S (Lieut.) Straits of Malacca, Penang, and Singapore. 2 Vols. 8vo. 26*s.*

NEWDEGATE'S (C. N.) Customs' Tariffs of all Nations; collected and arranged up to the year 1855. 4to. 30*s.*

NICHOLLS' (Sir George) History of the British Poor: Being an Historical Account of the English, Scotch, and Irish Poor Law: in connection with the Condition of the People. 4 Vols. 8vo.

The work may be had separately :—

History of the English Poor. 2 Vols. 8vo. 28*s.*
———— the Irish Poor. 8vo. 14*s.*
———— the Scotch Poor. 8vo. 12*s.*

———— (Rev. H. G.) FOREST OF DEAN. An Historical and Descriptive Account, derived from Personal Observation and other Sources, Public, Private, Legendary, and Local. Woodcuts, &c. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

NICOLAS' (Sir Harris) Historic Peerage of England. Exhibiting, under Alphabetical Arrangement, the Origin, Descent, and Present State of every Title of Peerage which has existed in this Country since the Conquest. Being a New Edition of the "Synopsis of the Peerage." Revised, Corrected, and Continued to the Present Time. By William Courthope, Somerset Herald. 8vo. 30*s*.

NIMROD On the Chace—The Turf—and The Road. Reprinted from the "Quarterly Review." Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 3*s*. 6*d*.

O'CONNOR'S (R.) Field Sports of France; or, Hunting, Shooting, and Fishing on the Continent. Woodcuts. 12mo. 7*s*. 6*d*.

OLIPHANT'S (Laurence) Journey to Katmandu, with Visit to the Camp of the Nepaulese Ambassador. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s*. 6*d*.

OWEN'S (Professor) Manual of Fossil Mammals. Including the substance of the course of Lectures on Osteology and Palæontology of the class Mammalia, delivered at the Metropolitan School of Science, Jermyn Street. Illustrations. 8vo. *In the Press.*

OXENHAM'S (Rev. W.) English Notes for Latin Elegiacs; designed for early Proficients in the Art of Latin Versification, with Prefatory Rules of Composition in Elegiac Metre. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 4*s*.

PAGET'S (John) Hungary and Transylvania. With Remarks on their Condition, Social, Political, and Economical. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 18*s*.

PARIS' (Dr.) Philosophy in Sport made Science in Earnest; or, the First Principles of Natural Philosophy inculcated by aid of the Toys and Sports of Youth. *Eighth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9*s*.

PARISH'S (Sir Woodbine) Buenos Ayres and the Provinces of the Rio de la Plata. Their First Discovery and Conquest, Present State, Trade, Debt, &c. *Second Edition.* Map and Woodcuts. 8vo. 15*s*.

PARKYNS' (Mansfield) Personal Narrative of Three Years' Residence and Adventures in Abyssinia. Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30*s*.

PEEL'S (Sir Robt.) MEMOIRS. Left in MSS. Edited by Earl Stanhope and the Right Hon. Edward Cardwell. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 7*s*. 6*d*. each.

PEILE'S (Rev. Dr.) Agamemnon and Choephoræ of Æschylus. A New Edition of the Text, with Notes. *Second Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo. 9*s*. each.

PENN'S (Richard) Maxims and Hints for an Angler, and the Miseries of Fishing. To which is added, Maxims and Hints for a Chess-player. *New Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 1*s*.

PENROSE'S (Rev. John) Faith and Practice; an Exposition of the Principles and Duties of Natural and Revealed Religion. Post 8vo. 8*s*. 6*d*.

——— (F. C.) Principles of Athenian Architecture, and the Optical Refinements exhibited in the Construction of the Ancient Buildings at Athens, from a Survey. With 40 Plates. Folio. 5*l*. 5*s*. (*Published under the direction of the Dilettanti Society.*)

PERRY'S (Sir Erskine) Bird's-Eye View of India. With Extracts from a Journal kept in the Provinces, Nepaul, &c. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s*.

PHILLIPS' (JOHN) Memoirs of William Smith, LL.D. (the Geologist). Portrait. 8vo. *7s. 6d.*

——— Geology of Yorkshire, The Yorkshire Coast, and the Mountain-Limestone District. Plates 4to. Part I., 20*s.* —Part II., 30*s.*

——— Rivers, Mountains, and Sea Coast of Yorkshire. With Essays on the Climate, Scenery, and Ancient Inhabitants of the Country. *Second Edition*, with 36 Plates. 8vo. 15*s.*

PHILPOTT'S (BISHOP) Letters to the late Charles Butler, on the Theological parts of his "Book of the Roman Catholic Church;" with Remarks on certain Works of Dr. Milner and Dr. Lingard, and on some parts of the Evidence of Dr. Doyle. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

PHIPPS' (HON. EDMUND) Memoir, Correspondence, Literary and Unpublished Diaries of Robert Plumer Ward. Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 28*s.*

POPE'S (ALEXANDER) WORKS. An entirely New Edition. Edited, with Notes. 8vo. *In the Press.*

PORTER'S (REV. J. L.) Five Years in Damascus. With Travels to Palmyra, Lebanon, and other Scripture Sites. Map and Woodcuts. 2 vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.*

——— HANDBOOK FOR SYRIA AND PALESTINE: including an Account of the Geography, History, Antiquities, and Inhabitants of these Countries, the Peninsula of Sinai, Edom, and the Syrian Desert. Maps. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 24*s.*

——— (MRS. G. R.) Rational Arithmetic for Schools and for Private Instruction. 12mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

PRAYER-BOOK (The Illustrated), with 1000 Illustrations of Borders, Initials, Vignettes, &c. Medium 8vo. Cloth, 21*s.*; Calf, 31*s.* 6*d.*; Morocco, 42*s.*

PRECEPTS FOR THE CONDUCT OF LIFE. Exhortations to a Virtuous Course and Dissuasions from a Vicious Career. Extracted from the Scriptures. *Second Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*

PRINSEP'S (JAS.) Essays on Indian Antiquities, Historic, Numismatic, and Palæographic, with Tables, illustrative of Indian History, Chronology, Modern Coinages, Weights, Measures, &c. Edited by EDWARD THOMAS. Illustrations. 2 Vols. 8vo. 52*s.* 6*d.*

PROGRESS OF RUSSIA IN THE EAST. An Historical Summary, continued to the Present Time. With Map by ARROWSMITH. *Third Edition.* 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

PUSS IN BOOTS. With 12 Illustrations; for Old and Young. By OTTO SPECKTER. *A New Edition.* 16mo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

QUARTERLY REVIEW (THE). 8vo. 6*s.*

RANKE'S (LEOPOLD) Political and Ecclesiastical History of the Popes of Rome, during the Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries. Translated from the German by MRS. AUSTIN. *Third Edition.* 2 Vols. 8vo. 24*s.*

RAWLINSON'S (REV. GEORGE) Herodotus. A New English Version. Edited with Notes and Essays. Assisted by SIR HENRY RAWLINSON and SIR J. G. WILKINSON. Maps and Woodcuts. 4 Vols. 8vo. 18*s.* each.

REJECTED ADDRESSES (THE). By JAMES AND HORACE SMITH. With Biographies of the Authors, and additional Notes. *New Edition, with the Author's latest Corrections.* Fcap. 8vo. 1*s.*, or *Fine Paper*, with Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

RENNIE'S (JAMES) Insect Architecture. To which are added Chapters on the Ravages, the Preservation, for Purposes of Study, and the Classification of Insects. *New Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 5*s.*

RICARDO'S (DAVID) Political Works. With a Notice of his Life and Writings. By J. R. M'CULLOCH. *New Edition.* 8vo. 16*s.*

RIPA'S (FATHER) Memoirs during Thirteen Years' Residence at the Court of Peking, in the Service of the Emperor of China. Translated from the Italian. By FORTUNATO PRANDI. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

ROBERTSON'S (REV. J. C.) History of the Christian Church, From the Apostolic Age to the Pontificate of Gregory the Great, A.D. 590. *Second and Revised Edition.* Vol. 1. 8vo. 16*s.*

———— Second Period, from A.D. 590 to the Concordat of Worms. A.D. 1123. Vol. 2. 8vo. 18*s.*

ROBINSON'S (REV. DR.) Biblical Researches in the Holy Land. Being a Journal of Travels in 1838, and of Later Researches in 1852. With New Maps. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

*** *The "Later Researches" may be had separately.* 8vo. 15*s.*

ROMILLY'S (SIR SAMUEL) Memoirs and Political Diary. By his SONS. *Third Edition.* Portrait. 2 Vols. Fcap. 8vo. 12*s.*

ROSS'S (SIR JAMES) Voyage of Discovery and Research in the Southern and Antarctic Regions during the years 1839-43. Plates. 2 Vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

RUNDELL'S (MRS.) Domestic Cookery, founded on Principles of Economy and Practice, and adapted for Private Families. *New and Revised Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo. 5*s.*

RUSSIA; A Memoir of the Remarkable Events which attended the Accession of the Emperor Nicholas. By BARON M. KORFF, Secretary of State. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.* (*Published by Imperial Command.*)

RUXTON'S (GEORGE F.) Travels in Mexico; with Adventures among the Wild Tribes and Animals of the Prairies and Rocky Mountains. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

SALE'S (LADY) Journal of the Disasters in Affghanistan. *Eighth Edition.* Post 8vo. 12*s.*

———— (SIR ROBERT) Brigade in Affghanistan. With an Account of the Seizure and Defence of Jellalabad. By REV. G. R. GLEIG. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

SANDWITH'S (HUMPHRY) Narrative of the Siege of Kars and of the Six Months' Resistance by the Turkish Garrison unde General Williams. *Seventh Thousand.* Post 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

SCOTT'S (G. GILBERT) Remarks on Secular and Domestic Architecture, Present and Future. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 9*s.*

SCROPE'S (WILLIAM) Days of Deer-Stalking in the Forest of Atholl; with some Account of the Nature and Habits of the Red Deer. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 20*s.*

———— Days and Nights of Salmon Fishing in the Tweed; with a short Account of the Natural History and Habits of the Salmon. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Royal 8vo. 31*s.* 6*d.*

———— (G. P.) Memoir of Lord Sydenham, and his Administration in Canada. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

———— Geology and Extinct Volcanos of Central France. *Second Edition,* revised and enlarged. Illustrations. Medium 8vo. 30*s.*

SHAW'S (THOS. B.) Outlines of English Literature, for the Use of Young Students. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

SIERRA LEONE; Described in a Series of Letters to Friends at Home. By A Lady. Edited by Mrs. Norton. Post 8vo. 6s.

SMITH'S (Wm., LL.D.) Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. *Second Edition.* With 500 Woodcuts. 8vo. 42s.

——— Smaller Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities. Abridged from the above work. *Fourth Edition.* With 200 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

——— Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography and Mythology. With 500 Woodcuts. 3 Vols. 8vo. 5l. 15s. 6d.

——— Dictionary of Greek and Roman Geography. With Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 30s.

——— Atlas of Ancient Geography. 4to. [*In preparation.*

——— Classical Dictionary for the Higher Forms in Schools. Compiled from the above two works. *Fourth Edition.* With 750 Woodcuts. 8vo. 18s.

——— Smaller Classical Dictionary. Abridged from the above work. *Fifth Edition.* With 200 Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

——— Latin-English Dictionary. Based upon the Works of Forcellini and Freund. *Fifth Thousand.* 8vo. 21s.

——— Smaller Latin-English Dictionary. Abridged from the above work. *Twelfth Thousand.* Square 12mo. 7s. 6d.

——— English-Latin Dictionary. Assisted by John Robson, B.A. 8vo. and 12mo. [*In preparation.*

——— Mediæval Latin-English Dictionary. Selected from the great work of Ducange. 8vo. [*Uniform with* Dr. Smith's "Latin-English Dictionary."]

——— Dictionary of Biblical Antiquities, Biography, Geography, and Natural History. Woodcuts. 8vo. [*In the Press.*

——— Gibbon's History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire. Edited, with Notes. Portrait and Map. 8 Vols. 8vo. 60s. (Murray's British Classics.)

——— Student's Gibbon; being the History of the Decline and Fall, Abridged. Incorporating the Researches of Recent Commentators. *Sixth Thousand.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

——— Student's Hume. A History of England from the Invasion of Julius Cæsar. Abridged from Hume, and continued to the present time. With woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7s. 6d.

——— History of Greece; from the Earliest Times to the Roman Conquest. With the History of Literature and Art. *Sixteenth Thousand.* Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. (Questions. 12mo. 2s.)

——— History of Rome; from the Earliest Times to the Establishment of the Empire. With the History of Literature and Art. By H. G. Liddell, D.D. *Eighth Thousand.* Woodcuts. Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d. [*Uniform with* Smith's "History of Greece."].

——— (Wm. Jas.) Grenville Letters and Diaries, including Mr. Grenville's Diary of Political Events, while First Lord of the Treasury. Edited, with Notes. 4 Vols. 8vo. 64s.

——— (James & Horace) Rejected Addresses. *Twenty-third Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 1s., or *Fine Paper*, with Portrait. Fcap. 8vo. 5s.

SOMERVILLE'S (MARY) Physical Geography. *Fourth Edition.* Portrait. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

———— Connexion of the Physical Sciences. *Ninth Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 9*s.*

SOUTH'S (JOHN F.) Household Surgery; or, Hints on Emergencies. *Seventeenth Thousand.* Woodcuts. Fcp. 8vo. 4*s.* 6*d.*

SOUTHEY'S (ROBERT) Book of the Church; with Notes containing the Authorities, and an Index. *Seventh Edition.* Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

———— Lives of John Bunyan & Oliver Cromwell. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

SPECKTER'S (OTTO) Puss in Boots, suited to the Tastes of Old and Young. *A New Edition.* With 12 Woodcuts. Square 12mo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

———— Charmed Roe; or, the Story of the Little Brother and Sister. Illustrated. 16mo.

STANLEY'S (Rev. A. P.) ADDRESSES AND CHARGES OF THE LATE BISHOP STANLEY. With a Memoir of his Life. *Second Edition.* 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

———— Sermons preached in Canterbury Cathedral, on the Unity of Evangelical and Apostolical Teaching. Post 8vo.

———— Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, with Notes and Dissertations. *Second, and revised Edition.* 8vo. 18*s.*

———— Historical Memorials of Canterbury. The Landing of Augustine—The Murder of Becket—The Black Prince—The Shrine of Becket. *Third Edition.* Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 7*s.* 6*d.*

———— Sinai and Palestine, in Connexion with their History. *Fifth Edition.* Map. 8vo. 16*s.*

ST. JOHN'S (CHARLES) Wild Sports and Natural History of the Highlands. Post 8vo. 6*s.*

———— (BAYLE) Adventures in the Libyan Desert and the Oasis of Jupiter Ammon. Woodcuts. Post 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

STEPHENSON'S (GEORGE) Life. The Railway Engineer. By SAMUEL SMILES. *Fifth Edition.* Portrait. 8vo. 16*s.*

STOTHARD'S (THOS., R. A.) Life. With Personal Reminiscences. By Mrs. BRAY. With Portrait and 60 Woodcuts. 4to.

STREET'S (G. E.) Brick and Marble Architecture of Italy, in the Middle Ages. Plates. 8vo. 21*s.*

STRIFE FOR THE MASTERY. Two Allegories. With Illustrations. Crown 8vo. 6*s.*

SWIFT'S (JONATHAN) Life, Letters and Journals. By JOHN FORSTER. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

———— Works. Edited, with Notes. By JOHN FORSTER. 8vo. *In Preparation.*

SYDENHAM'S (LORD) Memoirs. With his Administration in Canada. By G. POULET SCROPE, M.P. *Second Edition.* Portrait. 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

SYME'S (JAS.) Principles of Surgery. *Fourth Edition.* 8vo. 14*s.*

TAYLOR'S (HENRY) Notes from Life. Fcap 8vo. 2*s.*

———— (J. E.) Fairy Ring. A Collection of Stories for Young Persons. From the German. With Illustrations by RICHARD DOYLE. *Second Edition.* Woodcuts. Fcap. 8vo.

TENNENT'S (Sir J. E.) Christianity in Ceylon. Its Introduction and Progress under the Portuguese, Dutch, British, and American Missions. With an Historical Sketch of the Brahmanical and Buddhist Superstitions. Woodcuts. 8vo. 14*s.*

THREE-LEAVED MANUAL OF FAMILY PRAYER; arranged so as to save the trouble of turning the Pages backwards and forwards. Royal 8vo. 2*s.*

TICKNOR'S (George) History of Spanish Literature. With Criticisms on particular Works, and Biographical Notices of Prominent Writers. *Second Edition.* 3 Vols. 8vo. 24*s.*

TOCQUEVILLE'S (M. de) State of France before the Revolution, 1789, and on the Causes of that Event. Translated by Henry Reeve, Esq. 8vo. 14*s.*

TREMENHEERE'S (H. S.) Political Experience of the Ancients, in its bearing on Modern Times. Fcap. 8vo. 2*s.* 6*d.*

——— Notes on Public Subjects, made during a Tour in the United States and Canada. Post 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

——— Constitution of the United States compared with our own. Post 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

TWISS' (Horace) Public and Private Life of Lord Chancellor Eldon, with Selections from his Correspondence. Portrait. *Third Edition.* 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.*

TYTLER (Patrick Fraser), A Memoir of. By his Friend, Rev. J. W. Burgon, M.A. 8vo. *In the Press.*

UBICINI'S (M. A.) Letters on Turkey and its Inhabitants—the Moslems, Greeks, Armenians, &c. Translated by Lady Easthope. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 21*s.*

VAUGHAN'S (Rev. Dr.) Sermons preached in Harrow School. 8vo. 10*s.* 6*d.*

——— New Sermons. 12mo. 5*s.*

VENABLES' (Rev. R. L.) Domestic Scenes in Russia during a Year's Residence, chiefly in the Interior. *Second Edition.* Post 8vo. 5*s.*

VOYAGE to the Mauritius and back, touching at the Cape of Good Hope, and St. Helena. By Author of "Paddiana." Post 8vo. 9*s.* 6*d.*

WAAGEN'S (Dr.) Treasures of Art in Great Britain. Being an Account of the Chief Collections of Paintings, Sculpture, Manuscripts, Miniatures, &c. &c., in this Country. Obtained from Personal Inspection during Visits to England. 3 Vols. 8vo. 36*s.*

——— Galleries and Cabinets of Art in England. Being an Account of more than Forty Collections, visited in 1854-56 and never before described. With Index. 8vo. 18*s.*

WADDINGTON'S (Dean) Condition and Prospects of the Greek Church. *New Edition.* Fcap. 8vo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

WAKEFIELD'S (E. J.) Adventures in New Zealand. With some Account of the Beginning of the British Colonisation of the Island. Map. 2 Vols. 8vo. 28*s.*

WALKS AND TALKS. A Story-book for Young Children. By Aunt Ida. With Woodcuts. 16mo. 5*s.*

WARD'S (Robert Plumer) Memoir, Correspondence, Literary and Unpublished Diaries and Remains. By the Hon. Edmund Phipps. Portrait. 2 Vols. 8vo. 28*s.*

WATT'S (JAMES) Life. Incorporating the most interesting passages from his Private and Public Correspondence. By JAMES P. MUIRHEAD, M.A. Portraits and Woodcuts. 8vo. 16*s.*

——— Origin and Progress of his Mechanical Inventions. Illustrated by his Correspondence with his Friends. Edited by J. P. MUIRHEAD. Plates. 3 vols. 8vo. 45*s.*, or Large Paper. 3 Vols. 4to.

WELLINGTON'S (THE DUKE OF) Despatches during his various Campaigns. Compiled from Official and other Authentic Documents. By COL. GURWOOD, C.B. *New Enlarged Edition.* 8 Vols. 8vo. 21*s.* each.

——— Supplementary Letters, Despatches, and other Papers. Edited by his SON. Vols. 1 and 2. 8vo. 20*s.* each.

——— Selections from his Despatches and General Orders. By COLONEL GURWOOD. 8vo. 18*s.*

——— Speeches in Parliament. 2 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

WILKIE'S (SIR DAVID) Life, Journals, Tours, and Critical Remarks on Works of Art, with a Selection from his Correspondence. By ALLAN CUNNINGHAM. Portrait. 3 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

WILKINSON'S (SIR J. G.) Popular Account of the Private Life, Manners, and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians. *New Edition.* Revised and Condensed. With 500 Woodcuts. 2 Vols. Post 8vo. 12*s.*

——— Dalmatia and Montenegro; with a Journey to Mostar in Hertzegovina, and Remarks on the Slavonic Nations. Plates and Woodcuts. 2 Vols. 8vo. 42*s.*

——— Handbook for Egypt.—Thebes, the Nile, Alexandria, Cairo, the Pyramids, Mount Sinai, &c. Map. Post 8vo. 15*s.*

——— On Colour, and on the Necessity for a General Diffusion of Taste among all Classes; with Remarks on laying out Dressed or Geometrical Gardens. With Coloured Illustrations and Woodcuts. 8vo. 18*s.*

——— (G. B.) Working Man's Handbook to South Australia; with Advice to the Farmer, and Detailed Information for the several Classes of Labourers and Artisans. Map. 18mo. 1*s.* 6*d.*

WOOD'S (LIEUT.) Voyage up the Indus to the Source of the River Oxus, by Kabul and Badakhshan. Map. 8vo. 14*s.*

WORDSWORTH'S (REV. DR.) Athens and Attica. Journal of a Tour. *Third Edition.* Plates. Post 8vo. 8*s.* 6*d.*

——— Greece: Pictorial, Descriptive, and Historical, with a History of Greek Art, by G. SCHARF, F.S.A. *New Edition.* With 600 Woodcuts. Royal 8vo. 28*s.*

——— King Edward VIth's Latin Grammar, for the Use of Schools. 12*th Edition*, revised. 12mo. 3*s.* 6*d.*

——— First Latin Book, or the Accidence, Syntax and Prosody, with English Translation for Junior Classes. *Third Edition.* 12mo. 2*s.*

WORNUM (RALPH). A Biographical Dictionary of Italian Painters: with a Table of the Contemporary Schools of Italy. By a LADY. Post 8vo. 6*s.* 6*d.*

YOUNG'S (DR. THOS.) Life and Miscellaneous Works, edited by DEAN PEACOCK and JOHN LEITCH. Portrait and Plates. 4 Vols. 8vo. 15*s.* each.

BRADBURY AND EVANS, PRINTERS, WHITEFRIARS.

INTERNET